

THE

# CHURCH REVIEW.

---

VOL. II.

JANUARY, 1850.

No. 4.

---

## MOEHLER'S SYMBOLISM.

ART. I.—MOEHLER'S SYMBOLISM. New York: published by Edward Dunigan, No. 151 Fulton street, 1844.

MOEHLER'S Symbolism is one of the most able and celebrated controversial works that have ever emanated from the Romish Church. It created immense sensation upon its first appearance in Germany in 1832, and in that country passed through five large editions in the course of six years. It was hailed with acclamations by Roman Catholics, and attacked with earnestness by the Protestant writers of Germany. Its publication, in a translation, in this country, in the year 1844, has given it importance here, and the fact, that, in certain portions of our country, it is a work most likely to mislead active but partially instructed minds, who are in search of a harbor of religious rest, renders a notice of its character and of its style of argumentation, a service demanded by the interests of Catholic truth. We regard Moehler's book as the most dangerous one, in the spells of its Sirenian delusion, that we have ever seen from a Romish controversialist. It has, on its face, an air of great candor and love of truth, and of tender regard for those whom it treats as the victims of error and heresy, while, at the same time, it is throughout remarka-

ble for its suppression of the truth, and its unfair statements of the real position of the Romish Church, in matters of doctrine, discipline, and worship. Those who are allured to the Romish Church by Moehler's representations of her character and teaching, are doomed to a most cruel disappointment. Instead of finding, as he represents, the beautiful and tender Mother of our New Birth, they will be introduced to a foul and withered hag, ministering in the practice of her witchcrafts, as the pretended Priestess of the Most High,—instead of the pure realities of Christian faith, they will be taught the unwarranted inventions of human doctrine, which is still ever growing and developing,—instead of the simplicity of the holy worship of God through the one Mediator, they will see practically established and made prominent in the sanctuaries of Rome, the idolatrous worship of the Virgin and the Saints.

We propose to point out some of the concealments and unfair statements by which Moehler has succeeded in throwing such plausible attractions about the Church that he has undertaken to defend. In his very Introduction both this concealment and this falsehood appear. He states falsely, and of course unfairly, the doctrinal standards of the Romish Church. Among these standards, the only ones which he mentions, without reservation, as public confessions of the Romish Church, are the decrees of the Council of Trent. The Catechism of Trent and the Creed of Pope Pius IV, he rejects as writings possessing symbolical authority in the Romish Church, though he professes for them high regard. The Catechism, however, was published by direction of the Council of Trent, who left to the Pope the charge of approving and authorizing and publishing it. By him, in accordance with the decree of the Council, it was published. It is designed, as is stated by the Council of Trent, for the guidance of pastors in the instruction of their flocks, and is placed in the hands of the parochial ministers of the Romish Church, as instruction provided for the members of that Church, by those to whom the Council of Trent committed the charge of making such provision. Surely, then, this writing *has* symbolical authority in the Romish communion. And most undoubtedly the Romish Church cannot escape from the full responsibility of the Creed of Pope Pius, as one of its symbolical writings. In the Bull setting it forth, it was imposed "*juxta Concilii Tridentini dispositionem*" on all who held benefices in the Romish Church, having the cure of souls; it was also imposed on all members of the regular and military

orders. Upon all these classes of persons the injunction was laid that profession of faith should be made "juxta hanc et non aliam formam," "according to this form and no other," "sub poenis *per Concilium ipsum* in contravenientes latis," "under penalties denounced by the Council itself against opposers." In the form provided, by authority, for reconciling a convert to the Romish Church, the profession of this creed, which is recited, in the office, in full, is required of the proselyte. It is in vain to deny, therefore, that the Creed of Pope Pius is, in the strictest use of terms, the authorized Creed of the Romish Church, and that controversialist deals most unfairly, who denies this creed, as Moehler does, the place of a symbolical writing of that Church. Nor is this denial unimportant. The Creed of Pope Pius is appended to the Nicene Creed as part and parcel of the Creed of the Universal Church, and the acceptance of it declared necessary to salvation, it being expressly said, in this creed itself, that all that it contains is "the true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved." Such a declaration is so shameless, so directly opposed, too, to the decree of the General Council of Ephesus concerning additions to the Creed of the Universal Church, that it is an object for a Romish controversialist, if he can, to get rid of the embarrassment which this creed would occasion if he acknowledged it to be a symbolical writing of his Church. And Moehler, notwithstanding the Bull of Pope Pius imposing this creed, in accordance with the decrees of Trent, and under penalties denounced by that Council itself, and notwithstanding the use of this creed in the Romish Church in the reconciliation of converts, of whom certainly no more is required than of those born within her pale, and notwithstanding the imposition of this creed as "the true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved," has not scrupled, in the outset of his undertaking, to cast off the trammels of this unwelcome formulary. He knew full well that the decrees of Trent were carefully drawn up for purposes of controversy, as guarded statements of Romish doctrine,—not denying any of the errors of faith or practice which are retained in the Romish communion, but giving the most plausible accounts of them, which ingenuity could furnish, and leaving out of sight the strong views of doctrine and the abominations of practice, which, to this day, constitute the popular teaching and the authorized worship of that corrupt communion. Moehler has therefore planted himself exclusively upon the Trentine decrees, and would fain have his readers believe that when he has given the Trentine state-

ments of doctrine, he has presented a full view of the teaching and practice of the Romish Church on the points in question.

This arbitrary exclusion of authorized standards of faith and offices of worship, for which the Romish Church is responsible, runs through the whole of his book, and makes his representation of the Romish Church the mere trickery of a huckster, who shows the fair and sunny side of the fruit he offers for sale, while he studiously conceals the rottenness, which is eating into the core. And yet, while Moehler denies the symbolical authority of the creed of Pius, he admits, when it suits his purpose, the symbolical character of other papal determinations. He says, in a note, (p. 117,) "Popes Pius V and Gregory XIII, have condemned the following propositions," which he quotes, and then adds, "The opinion put forth in the earlier editions of this work, that the doctrine of the *donum supernaturale primi hominis*, though generally received among theologians, and grounded in the whole Catholic system, had not, however, received a formal sanction from the Church, must now be corrected." The determinations of Popes, then, are symbolical authority, when they advance Moehler's ends, but not so, when, as in the Bull of Pope Pius IV, setting forth his creed, they thwart those ends. The *animus* of Moehler as a controversialist and his unscrupulousness are here most plainly shown. The note, above quoted, admits also that doctrines not formally sanctioned by the Church, though generally received by theologians, may be "*grounded in the whole Catholic system*," an admission fatal to the great effort of Moehler's book to set forth the decrees of Trent as the only standard of Romish teaching. How a note, so completely exposing himself, found its way into his book, we are at a loss to determine.

In connection with his partial and insufficient delineations of the Romish Church, Moehler most studiously seeks to conceal the true position of the English Church, and to cover it, most unfairly, from view, by crowding it into an obscure, scarcely noticed place among the Calvinistic sects. The *thirty-nine articles*, forsooth, are all that he knows, or chooses to recognize, of the formularies of the English Church, and through the whole of his book he slurs over the English Church, as if he were afraid that the very mention of it would bring it into a dangerous prominence, as if he feared that a glimpse of her Apostolic and Catholic constitution would, at once, expose to his readers the vanity of his hard attempt to identify the schismatic position of Rome and her Pseudo-



Catholicity with the true and genuine Catholicity of the Ancient Church, as if the mere presentation of the Queen, in her simple, majestic beauty, would, at once, confound the pretensions of the upstart, in the meretricious attire of Trent, who would fain show herself in the true dignity of the ancient Apostolic line. Let those who are captivated by Moehler's glowing pictures of unity, and truth, and Catholicity, apply these very pictures to the Church, which he has studiously kept in the background ; and also to the real condition of *that* Church, as she is seen in her every day life, which he has presented only in the cautious, nicely worded decrees of Trent, and they will be at no loss to discover, at once, the trickery of Moehler's whole style of argumentation, and the truest home of Catholicity, which is now to be found upon earth.

But we proceed to exemplify, by some particulars, his style and mode of argumentation.

Of original sin, justification and sanctification, and the teaching of the Romish Church and Protestant confessions on these subjects, Moehler treats at length. To pursue his reasonings on these doctrines would take us too far from our present more immediate object, though we may, at a future time, enter into a somewhat extended examination of these points, in reference to his statements and reasonings. We remark, however, upon what he says about justification, that his own statements of the Romish doctrine on this subject, show the insufficiency and error of the doctrine, as defined by the Council of Trent. Moehler declares the identity of justification with inherent holiness, and denies that the justification of the sinner before God is the Forensic act of his acquittal. Justification, with him and the Romish Church, is making just, and so making just that sin is "extirpated," while, nevertheless, there is the inconsistency of admitting, as he expressly does, that (p. 192) "the sinfulness in concupiscence," which, in justification, "is removed, as it is driven from the inward to the outward man," "*survives*" nevertheless, "as the consequence and the chastisement of sin, and withal as a temptation, which may conduce either to the more exalted glorification of the soul, or to its relapse into the deepest fall. In the former case, it summons us to struggle and to victory, and to the confirmation and expansion of virtue ; in the latter, it can easily surprise the inattentive, and draw him into its toils, or penetrate into his inmost soul." Truly, when such a principle as this remains, though only in "the outward man," yet struggling to find its way to the "inmost soul," and capable of doing so, there has been a strange *extirpation* of sin. And yet Moeh-

ler says of *such* a justified person, (p. 192.) the "Catholic Church" "cannot find any further traces of sin in man, so soon as his spirit has been averted from the creature, and hath turned to God." Such a justification we should not call any more complete than Moehler can see in the justification of Calvinists and Lutherans, when, speaking of Calvinistic and Lutheran saints, he says, (p. 197.) "A singular saint, forsooth, who seeks his own interest, and not Christ's glory! Equally strange is the combination of ideas when we are required to conceive an immodest or avaricious saint; for, according to the laws of logic, the predicate destroys the subject." But equally strange, most assuredly, say we, is that combination of ideas, which requires us to believe that sin is *extirpated*, while, nevertheless, it is so in the system, that there is imminent danger of its penetrating to the inmost soul. And yet this is Romish justification, according to the statement of this its most plausible advocate. How different, how truly complete, is that view of justification, which is presented by the Catholic Church of England and America, which at once declares the completeness of justification on the part of God, without compromising the interests of holiness, or denying the plainest facts in the spiritual history and condition of regenerate man. This view of Justification declares it to be a Forensic act on the part of God, acquitting the sinner and receiving him into favor, while, at the same time, in the declaration that this Justification is granted to none, but those who possess a lively or fruitful faith, which works by love, and purifies the heart, it shows that the gift of Justification is inseparable from that of the Sanctifying Spirit. It does not, as the Romish Church does, *sink* the act of deliverance from condemnation in the act of imparting the principle of holiness, but gives due and distinct importance to each of these gifts, or rather, presents them clearly as the two-fold aspect of that one gift of the Spirit, who, at the same time, justifies, and imparts to the justified the principle of sanctification. It does not mar the gift of God, but sets it forth in that distinctness of each of its parts, and yet that inseparable conjunction of the parts, which show its completeness and its beauty. And then that "infection of nature," which "doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated," it acknowledges, as a plain fact of spiritual history open to observation, as well as declared by revelation, and from these remains of concupiscence, it deduces that struggle which is described in Scripture, as the great conflict of the Christian life, in the gradual advancement of Christian sanctification.

Did the limits of our article allow, we would like to bring the searching light of Scripture to bear upon these two systems of Justification, and show how completely the Romish system removes from view, and merges in sanctification, that Justification which the Scriptures ever connect with sanctification, and yet do not confound with it. We would like to show also the superiority of the true system in its influence of holiness. There is a curious specimen of Moehler's style of philosophizing, however, in his remarks on Justification, which we cannot forbear noticing, especially as it illustrates his systematic concealment of the true ecclesiastical position of the English Church. He says, (p. 188.) "It is worthy of remark, that the Protestants conceive justification to be a thing chiefly external, and the Church to be a thing chiefly internal, so that, in either respect, they are unable to bring about a *permeation* of the inward and the outward. The one, however, determines the other; for, as they consider not justification to be internal, the Church, according to their system, could not become external. When justification is not the inmost property of man, it is then too weak to possess the power to produce a complete effect, and to throw out the invisible into the visible, and consequently to make the inward Church simultaneously and indubitably an outward one. Hence that painful oscillation between the invisible and the visible Church, because justification was not conceived to be an internal thing." This is a piece of philosophizing more subtle than solid. The same style of reasoning might be adapted to any conclusion, according to the fancies of those who should adopt it. Thus we might retort upon Moehler in his own strain, that the Romish system of justification is so *inherent*, that it could never make its way out into visibility, and, on the other hand, that an external justification is, in its own nature, more adapted to an external Church, than one that is internal, which would be most apt to seek its own kind. We should, indeed, be ashamed to use such reasoning except as the child's play of philosophy; but yet, it is as good, as grave, as valid, as that to which we oppose it, being in the very same view of fanciful puerility. But such unsubstantial gossamer philosophy is not unusual with Moehler, who often surrenders himself to an ingenuity that degenerates into inanity, while it talks with all the gravity of the deepest wisdom. We have noticed this tendency of his, to talk nonsense in the tones and big words of philosophy, because it is, in him, really the artifice of a superior mind to entrap those who are captivated by what they think deep, simply because it is unmeaning, or unintelligible, or

in the pompous attire of philosophy. In fact, the above piece of philosophizing utterly disappears before a presentation of the real truth of the case. The Justification which we receive from God, is, according to the teaching of the English and American Churches, sealed, and conveyed, and made visible, through the Sacrament of Baptism, a Sacrament over which the Spirit presides, and which the Spirit invigorates. So that the visible Church, to which Baptism admits us, and the conveyance of justification to the soul, are both clearly recognized in the teaching of the English Church on the subject of Justification, and the presentation of this teaching by Moehler would have left no room for the piece of fanciful philosophy upon which we have remarked.

We pass to Moehler's remarks upon the Sacraments. In these, he shows an unabashed recklessness of assertion, when he says that the institution of seven Sacraments by Christ, is in accordance with Scripture and the well founded tradition of the Catholic Church, and also of the Greek Church; when it is notorious and capable of demonstration, that the doctrine of the seven Sacraments, as now taught by the Romish Church, was an invention of their schoolmen of the twelfth century, and opposed to the whole teaching of the Ancient Catholic Church on this subject, as has over and over again been shown by the opponents of the Romish doctrine. Indeed, Cassander, one of the Romish Theologians, asserts, "you will hardly find any one of the writers, before Peter Lombard, who maintained any certain and definite number of Sacraments," the word Sacrament being often applied, during the first eleven centuries, not merely to the two Sacraments instituted by Christ our Lord in the Gospel, but to any sacred rite or object. But this cool assumption of facts, which the history of the Church disowns and disproves, is very usual with Moehler. Thus he says, (p. 254,) "The Protestants," "with their wonted arrogance, have rejected the dogma of purgatory, *so well founded as it is in tradition*," when writers of the Romish Church, as Cardinal Fisher and Alphonsus a Castro, have admitted that "Aliquandiu purgatorium incognitum fuit, sero cognitum universae Ecclesiae," and "usque ad hodiernum diem, purgatorium non est a Graecis creditum." And the whole tenor of the prayers for the dead in the Ancient Church, as well as the teachings of its earliest writers on the state of the departed, show that purgatory was a doctrine wholly unknown and unrecognized. In comparison with the arrogance of this assertion of Moehler, the highest "arrogance" he could attribute to "the Protestants," is perfect modesty. Again, with

the same coolness and seeming naiveté, he asserts, (p. 310.) "According to the clear declarations of Christ and his Apostles, and the unanimous teaching of the Church, attested by the immediate followers of our Lord's disciples, Catholics firmly hold that in the Sacrament of the altar, Christ is truly present, and indeed in such a way, that Almighty God, who was pleased at Cana, in Galilee, to convert water into wine, changes the inward substance of the consecrated bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ." He refers for the maintenance of this assertion, to the Council of Trent, as, in vain, would he appeal, for its substantiation, to the testimonies of the Ancient Church. Again, he says of transubstantiation, (p. 320,) "This doctrine, which most undoubtedly was at all times prevalent in the Church, though at one time more clearly, at another less clearly expressed, according as occasion seemed to require, was, in the Middle Age, laid down as a formal dogma." These are specimens of the insidious manner in which he weaves into the texture of his plausible statements of Romish doctrine, the most palpable misstatements of the teaching of the Ancient Church, and thus seeks to obtain for Romish Doctrine a support from reference to the Ancient Church, which the slightest examination of testimonies would sweep away.

But to return to Moehler's view of the sacraments. He does not fairly and fully represent the Romish view of the *opus operatum* of the sacraments, as that view is brought out even by the Council of Trent. That Council teaches expressly\* that Attrition, which, it says, is "imperfect Contrition," and is the act of a person who has not the Holy Ghost "indwelling," is, nevertheless, sufficient to dispose him to obtain the grace of God in the sacrament of Penance. Here, certainly, the efficacy of sacraments, without a religious disposition that comes up to the requirements of God, is taught. And, throughout, in his view of the seven sacraments, Moehler represents them as means of permeating the whole "earthly being" of man with "the heavenly element," and as being insufficient for this purpose, unless they are seven in number, and applied at the beginning, middle, and end of our human existence. He represents them as extirpating, casting out sin, which yet ever seeks to return, and needs, at last, to be finally ejected, in spite of all previous expulsions, by Extreme Unction, (p. 289.) "and this, especially in the approaching dissolution of the bond between body and soul, never fails of its effect." Does not this

---

\* Sess. XIV, Cap. IV.

teaching subject the whole life of man to a series of charms, which are declared to be most effective, but which must, nevertheless, be constantly used, and, at last, consummated by a charm, which finishes an extirpation that is said, notwithstanding, to have been wrought by those which preceded it, while the utmost coöperation, that is absolutely necessary in man, is that "imperfect Contrition which is called Attrition?" Such is the system of sacraments, upon which Moehler expatiates in the most glowing terms. As usual, he leaves out of view the teaching of the English Church, which sets forth the two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel as efficacious instruments of divine grace, but whose efficacy to individuals is made dependent upon their possession of faith and repentance, upon their sincere endeavors to appropriate and carry out in their lives the grace proffered them in the sacraments. This view represents the sacraments, not as charms, which extirpate and yet do not extirpate sin, but as means by which the Divine Spirit furnishes the grace, which actually eradicates sin and causes the growth of holiness in those who, under His guidance, are walking in the way everlasting. It takes the appointments of Christ, as He has delivered them, and holds these to be sufficient, and strives to value and use them as those who must give account of the talents entrusted to them, and does not, in a presumptuous spirit of Rationalism, crowd the life of man with a series of imagined charms, which, in reality, cause him to relax his faithful endeavors in the work of his sanctification.

Moehler's view of the Eucharist is one of the most artful portions of his book. He gives an eloquent and captivating description of the presence of Christ with His people in all ages of His Church, and of that presence as especially manifested in the sacrament of the Altar. He refers to the representative sacrifice of the ancient liturgies, and then quietly and almost imperceptibly, though most unwarrantably, identifies this commemorative sacrifice with that real propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, which the Council of Trent\* asserts to be offered upon the altar at the celebration of the Eucharist. As quietly and as unwarrantably does he identify, in his account of the Eucharist, the real spiritual presence of Christ, as it was held in the ancient Church, with the modern Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation. And, in the face of all history, as has been demonstrated by Dailé and Whitby, he asserts the adoration of the host to have been a practice of the Church in the

---

\* Sess. XXII, Cap. II.

days when the Liturgy was in use, which bears the name of St. Chrysostom, and quotes a passage from that Liturgy, which does *not* prove his assertion; a passage in which worship is addressed to God, "O God, be propitious to me, a sinner," but not to the sacrament. Cardinal Bona admits that the practice of elevating the host, which preceded that of adoration, cannot be traced in the Latin Church higher than the eleventh or twelfth century, and Germanus, who lived in the thirteenth century,\* "is the first that mentions this elevation among the Greeks, without any notice of adoration." "He says, it was to represent our Saviour's elevation upon the cross, and his dying there, together with his rising from the dead." Durandus, who lived in the thirteenth century, is the first writer who mentions the adoration of the host as a practice of the Church.

Moehler has a most curious philosophical account of the original of the "formal dogma" of transubstantiation. He says that it was laid down in the Middle Age, in opposition to (p. 321) "a false pantheistic mysticism," which "confounded the distinctions between the human and the divine, and identified the Father with the world, the Son of God with the eternal idea of man, and the Holy Ghost with religious feelings. Several Gnostic sects, and afterwards, Amalrich of Chartres and David of Dinant, inculcated these errors. They regarded the historical revelation of God in Christ Jesus as a self-revelation of man, and the sacraments were, therefore, in the eyes of these people, nought else than what man chose of himself to attribute to them. Hence, they rejected them as useless; and, identifying with God the energies of the world, they conceived it singular that those powers, which in themselves were thoroughly divine, should receive, from any external cause, a divine nature or property. In this conjuncture of time, it appeared necessary to point out more clearly than had been done at any previous period, the primitive doctrine that had been handed down, and to set it in the strongest light with all the consequences deducible from it. The doctrine of a change of *substance* in created powers, to be applied as a divine and sanctifying nourishment of the spirit, most clearly established the opposition of Christianity to the fundamental tenet of these sects, which took so much pleasure in the world as to confound it with the Divinity; failing to observe that, through the creative energy of the Redeemer only could a new world be called into existence, and that, consequently, it was impossible for him to be engendered by the world!" This is one of those

---

\* Bingham, XV, Cap. V, Sec. 4.



precious pieces of philosophizing, which we noticed above. For ourselves, we cannot see what difficulty sects, which believed in the Divinity of the World, could have found in the manifestation of Divinity in the Bread and Wine of the Eucharist; and, in fact, we learn from the statements of the Council of Paris, (A. D. 1209,) that these very people, whom Moehler mentions, did believe the Body and Blood of Christ to be under the visible forms of Bread and Wine in the sacrament, and that the words of consecration were declaratory of this fact. Nor can we see that their error would be eradicated by teaching them that Bread and Wine could become the Divinity, and that it was lawful for them to adore a sacrament,\* which was only an appearance destitute of the substance, of which it is the appearance. Such a remedy is like the cure of superstition by infidelity; it is the cure of Pantheism by idolatry, or by the worship of a "*Deus factus*." The difference between these "Gnostics" and the "Catholics," who would find a remedy for their heresies, is, according to Moehler's own philosophy, the difference between "*creatum a Deo adorant*" and "*quem creant adorant*." Both worship creatures, but the Romanists, the creature of their own vain imaginations. The sentence with which Moehler concludes his account of Transubstantiation, is an affecting proof of the bondage in which the Church of Rome holds the people of Christ, in defiance, as the Council of Constance admits in its own decree, of the institution of Christ and the practice of the primitive Church. It is this, (p. 323 :) "However, we should rejoice, if it were left free to each one to drink or not of the consecrated chalice: and this permission would be granted, if with the same love and concord, an universal desire were expressed for the use of the cup, as, from the twelfth century the contrary wish has been enounced."

In his account of Protestant views of the Eucharist, he not only conceals, but he misrepresents the view of the English Church. He represents Calvin as pursuing a middle course between the Saxon and Helvetic opinions on this subject. Calvin, he says, (p. 325,) "taught that the body of Christ is truly present in the Lord's Supper, and that the believer partook of it. But he only meant that, simultaneously with the bodily participation of the material elements, which in every respect remained what they were, and merely signified the body and blood of Christ, a power, emanating from the body of Christ, which is now in heaven only, is communicated to

---

\* See Council of Trent, Sess. XIII, Cap. V.

the spirit." To this view, Moehler says, "the later Calvinistic formularies of faith adhere." Among these, he classes, in the Note which he appends, the Articles of the English Church, and quotes the twenty-eighth Article. Now the English Church clearly declares the Sacraments to be "effectual signs of grace," "by the which" God "doth work invisibly in us," and "means whereby" "we receive the inward and spiritual grace" which they represent. And of the Eucharist she declares, that God "hath given his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ not only to die for us, but *also* to be our spiritual food and sustenance *in* that holy Sacrament." This is much more than Moehler allows to her teaching. He had, undoubtedly, a reason for suppressing, in this place, a fair view of her teaching; for a presentation of that teaching would have shown its likeness to that view of the Ancient Church, to which he vainly strives to fit the modern view of the Trentine Council.

Moehler's chapter on the Church is one of the most labored, as well as one of the most sophistical portions of his book. It abounds in eloquent dissertation upon the unity and the unbroken tradition of the Catholic Church, and upon its power for good over the imagination, the reason, and the will of man, and its potency and necessity in the preservation of Christianity and in training Christians for their high, everlasting destiny. And to the truth and correctness of what he says about the Catholic Church, which has come down to us from the days of the Apostles, and brought with it, down the ages, the tradition of their doctrine, a tradition which will bear the test of Vincentius, "*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus,*" we assent, as well as yield our tribute of admiration to the eloquence with which Moehler sets forth the agency of the Catholic Church in the preservation of truth and the promotion of holiness. But we except to the *application*, which he makes of his eloquent description of the Catholic Church and her universal apostolic tradition. And any one, who, in reading this chapter of his work, will bear in mind and notice this application, will, at each turning point of his argument, continually discern its one grand and fatal fallacy. He magnifies the authority of the Church, which has come down to us from the Apostles, *bringing with it from them its teaching*, and upon the ground, that *this* Church was appointed by the Saviour for the transmission of His Truth and the edification of His people, calls upon us to recognize, without limitation, the authority of the *Romish Church*, and to receive her Decrees as those of a Church which is infallible, *thus quietly taking it for granted* that the Romish Church, as represented by the Council of Trent, is in the line of ancient Tradition,

and does but set forth the teaching of the Church of all ages. We are not, according to his statements, at liberty to inquire whether the Romish Church, in her Trentine Decrees, (and we would add, her creed of Pope Pius,) does fairly deliver to us the ancient teaching of the Church,—we are not at liberty to inquire whether she, as Moehler says the English Church has done, has “broken off the chain of tradition” by her Trentine Decrees and her Modern Creed. That, according to him, is not an open question. He says, (p. 379,) “The dogmatic decrees of the episcopacy, (united with the general head and centre,) are infallible; for it represents the Universal Church, and one doctrine of faith, falsely explained by it, would render the whole a prey to error. Hence, as the institution which Christ hath established for the preservation and the explanation of His doctrines, is subject, in this, its function, to no error; so the organ through which the Church speaks, is also exempt from error.” And again, he says, (p. 406,) “Hence, the ecclesiastical traditional principle is this: such and such a doctrine,—for instance, the Divinity of Christ,—is a Christian Evangelical truth, because the Church, the institution invested with authority from Christ, declares it to be his doctrine;—not because such or such an individual subjectively holds it, as the result of his scriptural reading, for a Christian truth.” And again, “In itself, therefore, and without any other medium, the Bible cannot be considered, by the Church, as a rule of faith: on the contrary, the doctrine of the Church is the rule, whereby the Scripture must be investigated.” It must be confessed that all this is very explicit. The Decrees of Trent, which, with Moehler, are “the dogmatic decrees of the episcopacy united with the general head and centre,” are infallible. They, without further inquiry, are to be received as the Tradition of the Catholic Church, and, according to them, must we understand the Scripture. And this is the grand conclusion of all his magnificent description of the Ancient Catholic Church and its tradition. All that we are to know of this tradition is to be found in the present consciousness and the authoritative declaration of the Episcopacy and the Pope of Rome, that *her figments are that tradition*, and in this consciousness and declaration there is infallibility. Truly of such premises and such a conclusion, we may say, “*Parturiunt montes, nascitur ridiculus mus.*”

Moehler says distinctly that the Catholic Church, meaning the Roman Church and those Churches in Communion, for he recognizes no other, does not inquire, in making her decrees, what past tradition has been, or what the Scripture says, for

of tradition and Scripture, her own living, present consciousness, without further consultation, assures her. (P. 367 :) "The certainty, which she has of the truth of her own doctrines, is an immediate one, for she received her dogmas from the lips of Christ and the Apostles; and by the power of the Divine Spirit, they are indelibly stamped on her consciousness, or, as Irenæus expresses it, on her heart. If the Church were to endeavor, by learned investigation, to seek her doctrines, she would fall into the most absurd inconsistency and annihilate her very self. For, as it would be the Church that should institute the inquiry, her existence would be presupposed; and yet, as she would have first to find out her own being, the thing, whereby and wherein she absolutely consists, namely, Divine Truth, her non-existence must at the same time be presupposed! She would have to go in search of herself, and this a madman only could do: she would be like the man that would examine the papers written by himself, in order to discover whether he really existed! The essential matter of Holy Writ, is eternally present in the Church, because it is her heart's blood,—her breath,—her soul,—her all. She exists only by Christ, and yet she must have to find him out! Whoever seriously reflects on the signification of those words of Christ, 'I am with ye even to the consummation of the world,' will be able to conceive at least the view which the Catholic Church takes of herself." And that view, we should say, is a very comforting one to self-sufficiency, even as much so, as Moehler represents the "inward witness" of the Lutherans to be to those who believe in it. Of this he says, (p. 381,) "But, this inward witness possesses a very decided advantage over the outward one. *Being the organ of the latter*, he is too inclined, in his narrative, to substitute his own pretended internal perceptions, for the testimony of the voucher, who stands by his side; and persuades himself that he is but faithfully relating what he had learned from without, when he has been listening only to himself, and in this wise has thrown every thing into confusion," just as Moehler would persuade us that the Romish Church is the Interpreter of ancient tradition and Holy Writ, when she only utters the "consciousness" of her Trent cabal, whose decrees have been the source of a disunion in the Church of God, which seems incurable, and which have not allayed, even in the Romish Communion, controversies on matters which are treated by the combatants as *de fide*. Between this "ecclesiastical consciousness" of the Trent cabal and the "inward perceptions," as Moehler represents them of the individual Lutheran, there is a middle ground; and it is

the ground of that Church, which not only praises ancient tradition, but consults it, which not only exalts Holy Writ, but studies it, that its teachings may be preserved, and which, like the Ancient Church, investigates questions that new controversies present, in the light of Scripture and of Catholic Tradition as an aid for the understanding of Scripture, and only as it follows these, claims acceptance for its determinations. When the Catholic Church develops herself in accordance with the divinely appointed Law of her Life, Scripture, and Catholic Tradition, and so far as she does this, she can appropriate the Promise, "I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." But her growth, like that of the material body, *depends* upon the observance of the law of her Being. And so any one of her branches may look for health and growth in the proportion in which it observes the law of the Church's life. But a development like that of Rome, who arbitrarily separates herself from the communion of her sisters of the Catholic family, and proclaims herself the Catholic Church, and follows her own self-devised laws of life, not acknowledging the supremacy of the Law of the Church's Living Head, cannot be other than a development of disease and death; and the appropriation, under such circumstances, of the Divine Promise, which Moehler quotes, is a Presumption which is the Precursor of Judicial blindness. Moehler tells us that, if Rome should investigate Holy Writ and Ancient Tradition, "she would have to go in search of herself, and this a madman only could do." She would indeed then find her ancient self, when she was the light of Christendom, because she was a true exponent of Scripture and Catholic Tradition, and this would be the course of true and holy wisdom, though if her heart be set upon retaining her Trentine Decrees and her Trentine Creed, it would be "midsummer madness" to go in search of herself in the light of that Ancient Teaching, with which Moehler would fain confound the teachings of the days of Trent and Pius IV.

It must, from what has been said, be sufficiently plain, that, by the Catholic Church, Moehler means the present Romish Church, which, the Council of Trent says, is the Mother and Mistress of all Churches,\* or, what is the same thing with him, "the episcopacy united with the general head and centre," that is, the Trent cabal, or any like Council. Bearing this in mind, the following passages display most fearfully the blasphemous arrogance of the Church, which he advocates. He

---

\* Sess. XXV.

says, (p. 340,) "*On the other hand, the authority of the Church is the medium of all, which in the Christian religion resteth on authority, and is authority, that is to say, the Christian religion itself; so that Christ himself is only in so far an authority, as the Church is an authority.*" (The italics are his.) Such language, in regard to the Catholic Church of all ages, would be fearful; but applied to the Romish Church, as his argumentation shows he means it to be, it is Blasphemy, from which even an advocate of her, whose Name is Blasphemy, might shrink. Again he says, (the italics are his,) "If the Church be not the Authority representing Christ, then all again relapses into darkness, uncertainty, doubt, distraction, unbelief, and superstition; *revelation becomes null and void, fails of its real purpose, and must henceforth be even called in question, and finally denied.*" As above, we say, he has in view here the Romish Church; for, to uphold that, his whole argument is constructed, and he makes an assertion directly the reverse of the fact; for, it has been shown, and might here be shown, did our particular object allow, that the *Romish Church* has been the fruitful Parent of Infidelity. Among her people it has been widely spread, and many avowed Infidels have been in the ranks of her Priesthood. Unbelief is the natural result of the false teachings, and corrupt worship, and Jesuitical casuistry of Rome, and of her claim to coin new doctrines under the specious pretense of development. It is blasphemous to say, as Moehler does, that the life of Christianity is bound up in the same bundle with that of the Trentine Decrees. And again he says, having in view, of course, the Romish Church, that the miracles of Christ broke the prescription of ancient error, and that the maintenance of the dispensation founded by these miracles is necessary to keep up belief in the miracles, (p. 342,) "the Church is conscious of owing her very existence to those miracles, and without them cannot at all conceive herself. Hence the fact again, that together with the authority founded by these extraordinary works of God, faith, too, in these works, ever simultaneously disappears." Undoubtedly, if *the Church* were extinguished, men would forget the miracles of Christ,—but the false claims of the *Romish Church* to miraculous power, have had no small influence in discrediting the genuine miracles of our Saviour Christ.

Moehler makes these arrogant assumptions, for the advantage of the Church of Rome, in the very midst of his eloquent descriptions of the glorious, holy, healthful influence of the Church, which has come down, in unbroken succession of

faith and institutions, from the Apostolic day, and then quietly *takes for granted* the minor premise of his syllogism, which *he suppresses*, that the Church of *Rome* is this Church which he has described, and thus seeks to insinuate into the unconscious mind of his reader, reverence for the authority of the Romish Church. This artful substitution of an article most different from that, which has been described,—of the Church of Rome for the Ancient Catholic Church,—of transubstantiation for the real presence held in the ancient Church,—of seven sacraments ordained by Christ for sacraments, in that general sense, in which the Ancient Church called any sacred rite,—such as exorcism, the salt given to Catechumens before Baptism, and the sign of the cross,—a sacrament; this change in the conclusion of what had been stated in the premise, or, which is the same thing, this *assumption* of the suppressed premise that the Romish Church is the same with the Universal Church of all ages,—is a most unworthy juggle, not a whit more honest or respectable than the substitution, in the mock auctions, of which we read, of a worthless article in the delivery, for the valuable one that was exhibited to tempt the bidder. The Church of Rome, which, as appears from Moehler's own statements above quoted, is the Church he means, in his whole argument, to recommend, is a most cruel mockery and caricature of that, upon which, in his glowing eloquence, he expatiates. How different, for example, was the reality of the hollow truce, at the Council of Florence, between the East and West, a truce brought about by chicanery, force, and bribery, and indignantly rejected by the whole Eastern Church, from the description, which Moehler gives of it, as an actual healing of a schism of centuries, and from his adduction of the magniloquent language of gratulation used by Pope Eugenius on that occasion. Even such, is the Catholicity of Trent to the true, high, glorious, ancient Catholicity, of which it vaunts itself the Descendant and the Representative, claiming to comprehend all the past in *its* present, to be the ever-during *Now* of Christianity upon earth.

And yet Moehler will admit the practical corruption of "priests, bishops, and popes," in times past. His language is strong on this subject. (P. 349 :) "Never would a system of doctrine like theirs (the Protestants') have sprung up, still less have obtained such wide diffusion, had individual teachers and priests been faithful to the duties of their calling. Truly, the ignorance could not have been slight, on which a system of faith like that of the Reformers, was imposed as worthy of acceptance; and thus Protestants may learn to estimate the



magnitude of the evil, which then oppressed the Church, by the magnitude of the errors into which they themselves have fallen. This is the point at which Catholics and Protestants will, in great multitudes, one day meet, and stretch a friendly hand one to the other. Both, conscious of guilt, must exclaim, "We all have erred—it is the Church only which cannot err; we all have sinned—the Church only is spotless on earth." That is, the solution of the present distracted state of Christendom will be the general acceptance of a Church, "the Mother and Mistress of all Churches," which, according to the statements of this her skillful advocate, acknowledges no rule, because *she* has the Spirit, and her rule is always present in her heart, and what, by her proper organ, she says, is infallibly true; and to this must bow the thoughts of men, their inquiries, all Ancient Tradition and Holy Writ; and even "*Christ himself is only in so far an authority, as the Church* (that is, the Church of Trent) *is an authority!*" From such a solution, which annihilates the responsibility of man to his Maker, and disowns the guides which God has given to His Church upon earth, from such thralldom to the arrogant assumption of a political cabal of the sixteenth century, from a Creed, which declares that, without such a faith there can be no salvation, "Good Lord deliver us," and all thy afflicted people, who are in those galling bonds of error and blasphemy.

But the possibility that the Trentine dogmas might not appear to be coincident with the ancient tradition of the Church *did* flit across the mind of Moehler, and he has endeavored to bridge over the gap between ancient tradition and the teaching of Trent. His bridge is the famed one of development. (P. 361 :) "For, every thing, that the human mind hath received from an external source, and which is destined to become its property, wherein it must find itself perfectly at home, must first be reproduced by the human mind itself. The original doctrine, as the human mind had variously elaborated it, exhibited itself in a much altered form; it remained the original, and yet did not; it was the same in substance, and yet differed as to form. In this process of the development of the Divine Word, during the Apostolic age, we may exalt as high, and extend as wide as we please the divine guidance, given to the disciples of Christ; yet certainly, without human coöperation, without the peculiar activity of man, it did not advance of itself. As in the good work of the Christian, free-will and grace pervade each other, and one and the same undivided deed is at once divine and human, so we find this to be the case here." We remark upon this passage from Moehler, that

the reproduction of the original doctrine by the human mind, the conception, the elaboration of it by the human mind is not the same thing with the original doctrine itself, and unless the reproduction or elaboration proceeds under the inspiration of the Spirit, its statements and results have no more authority than they derive from their true and real dependence upon the doctrine, about which they are employed. The Apostles and writers of Scripture, elaborated Christian doctrine under the inspiration of the Spirit, and, of course, their statements have the authority of revelation. The determinations of the Nicene Council about the person of Christ, are deduced from the doctrine laid down by the Apostles, and are *in* that doctrine, and they are therefore to be received as Articles of the Faith, being proved by the statements of the inspired writers.

Moehler, after the passage above quoted, goes on to say, "The same could not fail to hold good, even after the death of the Apostles, even after the Gospels and the Epistles were written; and whatever else we include in the canon of the New Testament, were already in the hands of the faithful. When, in the manner described, the Church explains and secures the original doctrine of faith against misrepresentations, the Apostolic expression is necessarily changed for another, which is the most fitted alike clearly to set forth and reject the particular error of the time. As little as the Apostles themselves, in the course of their polemics, could retain the form wherein the Saviour expounded His divine doctrine; so little was the Church enabled to adhere to the same. If the evangelical doctrine be assailed by a definite theological system, and a terminology peculiar to itself; the false notions cannot by any means be repelled in a clear, distinct, evident, and intelligible manner, unless the Church have regard to the form of the error, and exhibit its thesis in a shape, qualified by the garb, wherein the adverse doctrine is invested, and thus render itself intelligible to all cotemporaries. The origin of the Nicene formula furnishes the best solution to this question. This form is in itself the human, the temporal, the perishable element, and might be exchanged for a hundred others. Accordingly, tradition often hands down to later generations, the original deposit in another form, because that deposit hath been entrusted to the care of men, whose conduct must be guided by the circumstances wherein they are placed." This is clear, admirable, and true. But in adapting the form of doctrine to changing circumstances, the Church must hold inviolate the doctrine, and must therefore ever use and consult the means for preserving and ascertaining it, Scripture and universal tra-

dition of the truth of Scripture, which God has provided. But Moehler, as usual, goes on to make an application of the train of just remark above quoted to a most illegitimate purpose. He says, "Lastly, in the same manner as in the Apostolic writings, the truths of salvation are laid open with greater clearness, and in all their mutual organic connexion; so, in the doctrine of the Church, the doctrine of Scripture is ever progressively unfolded to our view. Dull, therefore, as it is, to find any other than a mere *formal* distinction between the doctrine of Christ and that of his Apostles; no less senseless is it, to discover any other difference between the primitive and the later tradition of the Church. The blame of this formal difference arises from overlooking the fact, that Christ was a God-Man, and wished to continue working in a manner conformable to his two-fold nature." This, at least, is *plain*. There is no more difference between the traditions of Trent and those of the Ancient Church, of Nice, of Ephesus and of Chalcedon; there is no more difference between the creed of Pius IV, and the creed of that General Council, which forbade, under penalty of deprivation, if they were clergymen, and anathema, if they were laymen, \* "any one to set forth, write, or compose any other creed than that which was determined by the Holy Fathers at Nice in the Holy Ghost, \* \* or adduce, or present it to those who are willing to be converted to the knowledge of the truth, either from heathenism or Judaism, or any heresy whatsoever," than there is between the doctrine of Christ's own lips, and the teaching of his Apostles! Of what arrogance of assertion are these men of Trent incapable? To what lengths will they not go in the maintenance of their false position? If that position had been seen by the General Council of Ephesus, it could not have been more clearly indicated and condemned than it is in the decree above quoted. It is of such a position that Moehler says, that those who do not admit it to be primitive in essence, and different only in form from that of the Ancient Church, fall into their mistake from overlooking the truth of our Lord's Incarnation! "O Deus in quæ tempora nos reservasti," when men annex such monstrosities to the holy central truths of our religion. After this assertion, Moehler goes on to say, that as "the expositions of Paul touching faith and the power of the Gospel," were occasioned by "the unenlightened zeal of the Jewish Christians for the law," as we must attribute to "the schisms in Corinth," Paul's "explanation of principles, in respect to the

---

\* Council of Ephesus, Act 6.

Church," as "the Gnostic and Manichean errors led to a clearer insight" into several specified doctrines, as "the Pelagian contest" opened up a clearer view of much important truth, so "Catholics" have gained by the errors of Protestants, and, since the council of Trent, have stood on a more shining summit of Christian knowledge, than even *they* had attained before! *Macte virtute puer*,—was the exhortation of the old Roman to one who was on a similar progress with that of the Romish Church in the days of Trent. It requires more than the assertion of Moehler to establish any connexion of the baleful fruit of Trent with the root and fatness of the tree, which Christ hath planted, or to show that the Trentine development is *like* that development of the doctrine of the Apostles and Evangelists from the Divine word, and of true Catholic Teaching from the doctrine of the Apostles and Evangelists, to which he compares it. The difference of the two kinds of Development, is well explained by Vincentius Lirinensis. \* "It is right and consistent that of the increase of wheaten teaching, we should reap a harvest of wheaten doctrine, the last and the first thus not differing between themselves. So that when in course of time any of those original seeds germinates and puts forth and is cultivated, there is notwithstanding no change in the properties of the germ; there may be additions to its form, appearance, and distinguishing characteristics, but it retains the same nature of its kind, whatever that may be. For God forbid, that those rose plants of Catholic sentiments should be changed into thistles and thorns," (as they were at Trent.) "God forbid, I say, that in that spiritual paradise, from stocks of cinnamon and balsam, darnel and aconite should be suddenly found to shoot," (as in the creed of Pius appended to the Nicene creed.) \* \* \* \* "For that those primitive doctrines of the heavenly philosophy should, in process of time, be more neatly dressed out, trimmed and polished, is admissible; but not so, that they should be altered." Moehler first captivates us with a view of the growth of † "the seed of wheat in the field of the Church," of "the rose plants of Catholic sentiments," and then exhibits, as specimens of this culture, those "thistles and thorns," the Decrees of Trent. He speaks of the "dressing out, trimming, and polishing of the heavenly philosophy," and then shows as the result, the *new* and vain wisdom of the Innovators of that Romish Council. He quotes the caution of Vincent, that there should be "*progress* of the faith, not *change*," and then produces to illustrate this "*progress*," the

---

\* Common, Cap. XXIII.

† Vincentus.

tamperings of the Trentine Fathers with holy, ancient truth. He concludes his section on Development by asserting (p. 363) "the necessity of a living, visible authority which in every dispute can with certainty discern the truth, and separate it from error." But it will be more than any Romish controversialist has yet adduced, which would persuade us to surrender ourselves to an authority that avowedly shuts its eyes to the outward light, in which itself professes to walk, because it declares that this light is in itself, and which requires us blindfolded to follow its guidance. Such is the position which Moehler himself assigns to the Church. We decline submission to such authority, because our Lord has cautioned us against blind leaders of the blind.

Moehler is singularly disingenuous in the view which he presents of the state of the departed, of Purgatory and of the Invocation of Saints and Angels, according to the doctrine of the Romish Church. He represents purgatory as a necessary consequence of the Romish doctrine of justification, since there must be, here or hereafter, that complete purification, which the Justified must attain before admission into heaven. He is obliged, also, to hint at Purgatory as a place of "punishment," but he keeps in the background the teaching of Trent,\* that, in the temporal penalties, which are due after the eternal punishment of sin is remitted in the sacrament of penance, *we make a satisfaction for sins like that of Christ*, (*"dum satisfaciendo patimur pro peccatis, Christo Jesu, qui pro peccatis nostris satisfecit, ex quo omnis nostra sufficientia est, conformes efficimur,"* are the words of the Council;) he leaves out of view also the universal teaching of the Romish schools, that the pains of Purgatory are the satisfaction, by the Justified, of those penalties, which have not been remitted, by the blood of Christ, in the absolution of the Penitent. That is, the blood of Christ is not a sufficing satisfaction for sin, (though the Council of Trent *says*, "all our sufficiency is from him," in the very sentence in which it declares the necessity of other satisfaction in addition to his,) but those, who have received the benefit of his satisfaction, must still make up for its deficiencies by satisfactions of their own, either in this world, or in purgatorial fire. There is no wonder that Moehler shrunk from the avowal and the defense of this teaching, which is undoubtedly the teaching of the theologians of his Church. Indeed he so artfully weaves together in his statement, the *purifying* and the *punitive* character of Purgatory, giving by

---

\* Sess. XIV, Cap. VIII.

far the greatest prominence to the former, as well nigh to hide this teaching so hard to defend. He defends the practice of masses and prayers for souls in Purgatory, and he says, (p. 419.) "this custom may be proved to have been authorized by the practice of the primitive Church; and is, accordingly, revered by us as an Apostolic tradition." There is effrontery, indeed, in this assertion,—for he well knew that the prayers of the Ancient Church were for the Virgin Mary, for Prophets, Apostles and Saints, who were believed, and whom the Romish Church believes, to have been in rest and peace; and that these prayers did not at all contemplate those for whom they were offered, as being in a state of suffering. Purgatory we have seen to have been admitted by distinguished Romish writers as of late introduction in the Church. Moehler says, "as to the mode of punishment, and the place which Purgatory occupies, the Church teaches nothing further; for she has, on this point, received no special revelations; and when we use the expression, 'Purifying fire,' we employ it only in the usual figurative sense." He knew that the representation of the fire of Purgatory as fire differing only in duration from that of Hell, pervades the writings of the standard theologians of Rome. Bouvier, Bishop of Mans, writes, "the constant belief of the Latins is, that there is in Purgatory a material fire like the fire of Hell. Natalis Alexander says, "*According to the more probable opinion* RECEIVED BY THE CHURCH, the fire of Purgatory is real and corporeal, and nevertheless tortures incorporeal souls," and Benedict XIV says, "the Church, in that anthem or offertory in Masses for the dead, means the punishments of Purgatory; and calls Purgatory, Hell, because there is the same fire in both places." Moehler knew also, that Cardinal Perrone but expresses the universal belief of Romanists, when he says "that some of those things," which "do not pertain to faith," although they be not defined, cannot be rejected without a mark of temerity; since not only the *common doctrine of theologians* concerning them, (from which it is unlawful for any discreet Catholic to depart without most weighty reason,) is sufficiently known; but also *the sense of the Church herself*, especially with reference to the severity of the punishments with which souls are tortured in Purgatory." And we have seen that Moehler himself admits that a doctrine generally received among theologians, may be grounded in the whole Catholic System, without a formal sanction from the Church. Now the Roman theologians generally receive the doctrine that the punishments of Purgatory are the same with those of Hell, duration only excepted, and they tell us that this is the more

probable opinion received by the Church ; and notwithstanding all this, Moehler tells us, "when *we*, (that is, Romanists,) use the expression 'purifying fire,' we employ it *only* in the usual figurative sense." The exposure of this statement would not be worth the space we have bestowed upon it, did it not plainly illustrate how reckless, and unscrupulous, and utterly unworthy of credence, Moehler is, in his controversial statements. He certainly renders apparent *his* belief, that the doctrine that the Justified must be subjected to punishments, the same in nature with those of Hell, as an expiation of offences, for which Christ's satisfaction has not removed all liability, as "a revenge and chastisement for past sins," (to use the language of the Council of Trent,) from the full consequences of which, Justification by Christ has not delivered us, was a doctrine difficult to maintain, and that "the better part of valor" in this case was "discretion."

Equally disingenuous is he on the subject of the Invocation of Saints, or, to use his own words, on "the intercourse subsisting between us and the triumphant church." He declares that, to intercession on the part of the Saints for us, answers invocation for that intercession on our part ; and that both are the result of our union in Christ, and redound to His glory. This is, in brief, his representation. He entirely leaves out of view the addresses to the Saints sanctioned by Bulls of Indulgence, and those contained in the Breviary, the Missal, and in popular books of devotion, and which have often been adduced, which do not merely ask Saints, and Angels, and the Virgin Mary, to intercede for us, but ask them directly for grace, for pardon, for protection, as God only should be asked. Moehler does not dare to mention or defend these, and yet he is in a position, in which he could not attack or condemn them, because they are authorized by his Church. We quote the language of Palmer to Wiseman, which represents the position of every Romish Controversialist on this subject. "Romanists are continually assuring us, that they only invoke the Saints to "pray for us" to God, and that they are, therefore, most unjustly accused of idolatrous practices. I showed that it is an *authorized* practice in your Communion, to pray to the Saints in the very terms in which God is addressed ; to offer them Divine honors, to regard them as fountains of grace ; to place religious trust and confidence in them ; to set them, in every respect, on a level with God. You had repudiated all such imputations ; but when they were actually brought home to your Communion, you at once stepped forward to express your approbation of all the most obnoxious expressions and practices that had



been adduced, and to justify them by still more objectionable passages from spurious and forged writings."

The Anglican Church may well maintain that she herself is on true Catholic ground in the rejection, from her services, of all invocations of saints, when, in no liturgy of the Church, as we are assured by liturgical writers, are there invocations of the saints, before the eighth century, and when Councils, such as Laodicea, and Fathers of the early centuries most decidedly reject prayers to any but God, and also expressly reject petitions to saints and angels to intercede for us. Mr. Palmer has shown this clearly in his fifth letter to Dr. Wiseman. And especially may the English Church felicitate herself on the freedom of her liturgical worship, when we have such a declaration as the following from Moehler. (P. 420:) "Lastly, it is to be borne in mind, that the doctrine of the Church does not declare, that the saints *must*, but only that they *can* be invoked; since the Council of Trent, in the passage we have cited, says, 'only that it is *useful and salutary*, to invoke with confidence the intercession of the saints.' Of faith in the divinity of Christ, and in his mediatorial office, or in his sanctifying grace, and the like, the Church by no means teaches that it is merely useful and salutary, but that it is absolutely necessary to salvation." Moehler here shows the inconvenience, to his mind, of this practice, but not to say that one could not attend upon and engage in the services of the Romish Church without invoking the saints, he is short of the truth, when he says, that the Council of Trent does not declare that the saints *must* be invoked. That very declaration of Trent, which he cites, says, just below the passage which he cites, "*illos vero, qui negant, sanctos, aeterna felicitate in coelo fruentes, invocandos esse \* \* \* \* impie sentire,*" that they, who deny that the saints enjoying eternal happiness in heaven, "*ought to be invoked*, are impious in their opinions;" the same declaration of the Council also pronounces it "good and useful" to seek not only the prayers of Saints, but also their "aid and assistance," (*ad eorum orationes, opem auxiliumque confugere,*) which is more than Moehler attributes to the doctrine of the Council, and which embraces the authorized prayers of the Romish Church that transcend the "*ora pro nobis.*" And yet, in this very sentence, the Council, as if it delighted to bring the name of Christ forward in those connections, in which it most derogates from His honor, speaks of Him as "our only Redeemer and Saviour," and then goes on to say, that it is "good and useful to fly to the prayers, aid, and assistance of the saints,"

"for the purpose of obtaining benefits from God through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour!" Truly, the One Mediatorship of Christ seems to be acknowledged by these men of Trent, only to show how boldly, by their decrees, they can set it aside. Thus much for Moehler's assertion that the Council of Trent says "*only* that it is useful and salutary to invoke with confidence the intercession of the Saints." And for his assertion that "the Church" does not teach the doctrine of invocation of Saints as one "absolutely necessary to salvation," it will be sufficient to adduce the Creed of Pope Pius IV, which declares as an article of that "true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved,"—"Sanctos una cum Christo regnantes, *venerandos atque invocandos esse*, eosque orationes Deo pro nobis offerre, *atque eorum reliquias esse venerandas.*"

With regard to Indulgences, Moehler pursues the same course of concealment, which he does with reference to Purgatory and the Invocation of Saints. He admits, indeed, that the ancient Church, unlike the Romish Church, gave absolution after and not before satisfaction; and this satisfaction, in the ancient Church, was that penance, which was inflicted, in this life, in the discipline of the Church, as a means of preparing penitents for reception again to the privileges of Church communion. In the Romish Church, however, Indulgences are the remission of satisfaction, which is due for sin, *after* the sinner has been released from its eternal penalty by justification in Christ; and practically, these indulgences are made the great motives to acts of devotion, and of benevolence, as well as incitements to the veneration of saints and images and relics. They are thus made to withdraw men from Christ, and to hold before them, as the great consideration of their Christian existence, that satisfaction for sin, which Christ did not make, but which men must perform for themselves. Such is the established system of opinion and practice on this subject in the Romish Church, and Moehler could not deny it. He therefore contents himself with the shuffling remark, (p. 310,) "At a later period, many theologians gave greater extension to the doctrine of Indulgences; but their opinions, *though very well grounded*, have not been declared articles of faith in any formulary of the Church, and, therefore, enter not into the plan of this work. The Council of Trent, *with wise precaution*, decreed no more, than that the Church has the right to grant indulgences, and that these, dispensed with wisdom, are useful."

It seems that\* "the honor and veneration due" to "the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God and the other saints," did not enter into the plan of Moehler's work, as he has not once noticed this subject. He probably thought that the declaration of the Council of Trent, that "the honor which is shown to them is referred to the prototypes, which they represent," was a hard one to manage; he probably knew that this declaration has been used by the distinguished theologians of Rome to support the "probable opinion," which they advocate, that *Latria* is due to the images of Christ, of God, of the Trinity, of the Cross, of the Virgin, and to the relics of Christ, of the true Cross, and of the instruments of the Passion; he probably knew that this is an opinion, which no Romish theologian would venture to anathematize; and he certainly knew that the Creed of Pope Pius declares it an article of the "true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved,"—"that the images of Christ, and of the Mother of God, ever Virgin, also of the other Saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honor and veneration ought to be given to them." No wonder then, that Moehler let entirely alone this subject of the worship of images.

He writes, throughout, as one, who feels that he has a hard cause to defend. Glowing descriptions of ancient truth and of the ancient Church, which are out of place, when applied to the modern definitions and the cabal, which he strives to defend; studious concealment of that Church, which, more than any other on earth, approximates to the ideal, that he draws, and which follows the rule that he exhibits only to show how arrogantly his Church can pocket it, as needless for her; an artful confusion of Romish novelties with ancient illustrations and explications, which were developments of the *Truth*; reckless misstatements of the plainest facts of ancient Church History; suppression of the truth about practices of worship and discipline, which it would be dangerous to exhibit, as they are set forth in standard treatises of the Roman schools of theology; a denial of the symbolical authority of a creed, which his Church sets forth, as "the true Catholic faith without which no man can be saved," and of a Catechism which she has provided for the instruction of her members in her doctrine;—and delineations of the theoretical working of the Romish system, which its whole history, the infidelity and immorality and idolatry that follow in its train, disprove in practice,—such is the tissue, such is the staple of Moehler's argumentation. And

---

\* Conc. Triden., Sess. XXV.

it is certainly the line of argument, not of one who is intrenched in Truth, but of one, who has a weak and a difficult cause to defend.

It is hard, and we pity the advocate who undertakes the cause, it is hard to defend a Church, whose Catholicity must be tested by placing the Decrees of Trent and the Creed of Pope Pius in the light of Scripture and ancient tradition ; which has assumed authority over Scripture and ancient tradition, because she proclaims herself Mistress of both ; which has invented sacraments that she dares to stamp with the name of Christ ; which claims authority to mutilate a sacrament of the Lord's appointment, by taking from it an essential part ; which has devised a scheme of satisfaction that draws men away from Christ, and makes them dependant on herself ; which then takes her round of sacraments in her hand, and applies them to her people as charms, which work *ex\* opere operato*, assuring them that these applications will avail even to those who exercise an "imperfect contrition," that they avail to the extermination of sin,—and yet, with all the cruelty of a sorceress, she tells them that the efficacy† of these her sacramental charms is suspended upon the "intention" of the celebrating priest to do what the Church does, so that the intention of the priest *not* to do this vitiates the sacrament ; and then she reminds her people that, though sin is "extirpated" in the Justified, it may ever recur, and that, therefore, they must continually resort to these sacraments, which confer grace "*ex opere operato*," and even, *when they are justified*, they must still, for themselves, render penal satisfaction to the Law, and that even, when they have passed into the eternal world, her coffers must be filled, to secure her intervention in the deliverance of their souls from purgatorial fire, a fire which differs, only in duration, from that of Hell. Thus does she strive to keep men under the constant influence of her incantations, making promises, which she herself declares are not performed, giving her children, when they ask bread, a stone, and, for a fish, a serpent. By such traffic, if *she* be the *gainer*, *immortal souls* are the *losers*.

To defend such a Church as this, is a task, which we envy no man. We remember the Church of Rome in the truth, the purity, and the charity of her ancient day, but, when we look at her, as she is seen in the Decrees of Trent, in the Creed of Pius, in the advocacy of Moehler, in her practice and worship,

\* Conc. Triden., Sess. VII., Can. VIII., De Sacramentis.

† Conc. Triden., Sess. VII., Can. XI., De Sacramentis.

the exclamation arises, "How is the gold become dim ; how is the most fine gold changed !" Would that she would do what Moehler declares the part of a madman, "*go in search of herself* ;" for, it is madness indeed, if she imagines that she is identical with her ancient self. Seeking to return to those days of her golden existence, and using, for this purpose, the guidance she now disowns, she will be received by Him, who "remembers the kindness of her youth, the love of her espousals," and she will then find herself, side by side, one in love and communion with that Church, whose position of true Catholicity her advocates fear, while they studiously endeavor to conceal it and overwhelm it with contempt.

## SOCIALISM.

- ART. II.—1. *The Life of Charles Fourier*. By CH. PELLARIN, M. D. New York: Dewitt & Davenport, Tribune Buildings, 1848.
2. *The Organization of Labor and Association*. By MATH. BRIANCOURT. Published at the same place, 1848.
3. *Love in the Phalanstery*. By VICTOR HENNEQUIN. 1849. Same publishers.
4. *Concise Exposition of the Doctrine of Association*. By ALBERT BRISBANE. New York: J. S. Redfield, Clinton Hall, 1847.
5. *French Ideas of Democracy and Community of Goods*. North American Review, Oct. 1849.
6. *Democracy*. London Quarterly Review, July, 1849.

WE have placed at the head of this article, a few, among the very many sources, from which we have gleaned the materials for the following reflections. And sad though the confession may be, and humiliating to the aspirations and conceit of human pride and glory, it is, nevertheless, one which is forced upon us at every step in the process of investigation, how utterly hopeless, and unsatisfactory, and inconclusive, are all mere human speculations, as to the tendency or ultimate results of all social reforms, and especially of those now in progress. The whole social fabric is so wonderful, so mysterious, and at the same time so simple and so quiet in its going forward, that we are hardly conscious of its importance, its bearings, its incomprehensible and inappreciable checks and balances, until its movements are disturbed, its elements confounded, and its multifarious and indispensable offices interrupted.

And it is this wonderful simplicity in the organization of the social machinery, which so readily invites every new experimenter to undertake the remodeling of its construction, the recasting of its proportions and relations, with as little hesitancy or distrust, as he would take down an old chimney or a wornout clock. It is the recklessness and the ignorance of these senseless, stupid manipulators upon the work of the Almighty, which give them their unblushing assurance.

Men do not seem yet to have learned the very first lesson in regard to the works of the Creator, of which social relations, and social progress, are some of the most wonderful and mysterious. They do not yet seem to feel that it is man's duty to learn in humble submission, to labor in faith, and to wait for the early and latter rain, to "be still and know that I AM God, and that there is none else beside me."

There is, perhaps, no trait in human character, which, to an impartial observer, is so obvious, so constant in its operation, and at the same time so utterly subversive of all hope of good, as the daily and hourly struggle going on between the laws of God and the devices of man; between offending, self-willed, and short-sighted humanity, and the Creator, the Redeemer and Sanctifier, the Upholder and Protector of this erring world. There are essentially but two systems, or theories, in regard to social regeneration, which the world has ever known; the one religious, the other political or philosophical; the one resting in obedience to the Supreme Lawgiver, the other basing itself upon its own strength, and looking to the results of its own vain speculations; the one founded in faith, the other in sight; the one leaning alone upon the arm of Omnipotence, the other standing up in its own puny impotence, and exclaiming, of the beauty of the earth, and the majesty of the heavens, and the symmetry and symphony of the universe, "Lo, all this have I done for myself!" or, what is equally absurd, "All this is accidental and perpetual!" These men you shall hear prating largely of Philosophy, of Progress, of Reform, of Regeneration; but if we listen to their mode of operation, the processes by which these wonders are to be wrought out, we are transported backwards to the plains of Shinar, and Babel itself shall not be able to comprehend the variety of tongues which their voices utter. And their experiments are as unsuccessful as their theories are unreasonable, ending always in loss, and confusion, and overwhelming despair. Such is the sad tale which all history reads us, and which leaves little hope, from present indications, that the social and political reforms now going forward in the old world will be able to redeem our race from its acknowledged evils.

We believe, indeed, in social reform and in political progress, as we believe in the general advancement of the race, in physical, moral, and intellectual culture. We know that such is the will and the purpose of the Almighty. But this is a problem which can only be accomplished in one mode, that is, in simple, childlike obedience to the will of the Supreme



Lawgiver. There is, in our belief, no other name given under heaven, and among men, whereby we can be saved. And believing this, we must be allowed to avow it, and to teach it in the fullest, most undisguised manner; but we hope always to be able to do this in that spirit of humility and teachableness which such a faith demands.

One of the more remarkable traits of modern reforms is the principle, so to speak, of what has been sometimes called *comeouterism*, or separation without rebellion. The idea of distinct and concurrent organizations, for carrying forward the same general object, and in the same field, was esteemed, until a comparatively late period, a gross absurdity; too much so, to be seriously entertained by sound minds. *Imperium in imperio*, is indeed a phrase known to antiquity, but which was nevertheless supposed to involve a direct solecism.

This process of separation is one which finds no parallel in nature, it has no pattern in all the works of the Almighty. In all animal and vegetable life, in the succession of the seasons, in the motions of the earth or of the planetary system, and in all the works of creation, we find the most perfect symmetry and unity, a model of that catholic spirit and organization which the fragmentary form of modern civilization seems to have studiously departed from, and, in its own self-sufficient wisdom, set up a model of its own. Whether, upon the whole, it will fare better, or eventuate more favorably, than did the war of Satan and his angels, or the experiment of the builders of Babel, remains to be seen. Certain it is, that this principle, if principle it may be called, which is based upon mere personal preference, has been carried so far, even in our favored New England, that the most sagacious and far-seeing of these separatists begin to recoil from the consequences of their own doings.

We beg leave here to make a brief extract from the published works of the Rev. Orville Dewey, D. D., who, although not now a resident of New England, is of the same school of separatists, and whose testimony upon this subject will by them be esteemed reliable.

"I allow," says this writer, "that the multiplicity of sects, in this country, is some bond for their mutual forbearance and freedom; but the strength and repose of a great establishment, are, in some respects, more favorable to private liberty."

We have quoted this authority, not because we intend to advocate religious establishments of any kind. We have no faith whatever in any such thing. Not that the contact

between religion and the State is calculated to fetter or impede the latter, but that it saps the life and energy of the former. But we have been painfully impressed with the correspondence exhibited, at the present hour, between the divided state of Christianity among us, and that declaration of our blessed Lord, a family, a state, or a kingdom, divided against itself, cannot stand. And it has sometimes seemed to us, that the efforts at association, which are so constantly going on in this country and elsewhere, might spring from the consciousness, among the people, that the Church was not doing her proper office, in uniting, in one bond of brotherhood, all nations, kindreds, and people. And whether, upon the whole, this constant disposition to separation among us, into indefinitely minute fragments, may not proceed, more from impatience of restraint, and a want of proper appreciation of the duty of obedience, than from any thing else, is a serious inquiry, and one that may hereafter demand grave consideration. And if one who has tried the principle of separation, till he has gone quite out of the pale of Church orthodoxy, has, by his own reflections, and what he has seen of the working of the system, become satisfied that this process of freedom of opinion ends in tyranny and oppression, it is time, perhaps, to pause in this mad career of separation, and to ask himself, whither this *ignis fatuus* will be likely to lead, and what shall be the end of these things.

This process of separation has already gone so far, and its principle, and the belief of its perfect propriety has become so unquestioned among us, that it is difficult to find minds so trained, as to comprehend the importance of any thing like organic life, in the religious or social organizations under which we live. Every man comprehends, readily enough, the absurdity of having two or more supreme and concurrent legislatures in the State, or of having a similar organization in colleges and schools, and indeed in every thing but the Church. If they attempt any social reform, like the temperance society, they seem, readily enough, to appreciate the propriety of having regard to superiority and subordination in all its departments, and a oneness of life and organization running throughout the entire operation. But in regard to Christianity, it seems to be supposed, it may be just as successful in reforming and regenerating social existence, when scattered over the surface of society in dead fragments, riven from the common life of the Church, and even when divided and subdivided, again and again, and literally warring against itself, as when it presents one unbroken, one undivided front, armed at

all points against the infinite devices and temptations by which she is everywhere beset from without. But not so her enemies. They see and feel that she is thus made weak, shorn of her authority and her strength; that her respect is thus taken from her, and she becomes a scorn and a scoff, a humble suppliant, to be spurned at by a bold, and daring, and profane world.

But while we admit that it does seem to us that the Associationists perceive wherein the Church, in her present fragmentary and divided state, fails to do her proper office, it is obvious they have only made the matter more hopeless, by setting up a new schism, by inculcating a new and bolder heresy than was attempted by their predecessors. We do not, indeed, comprehend how the principle of this scheme is essentially different from that of Independency or Congregationalism. We know not, surely, why every Congregational Association in New England, whether more or less orthodox in doctrine, might not, at once, be converted into a Phalanstery, by a simple vote of the majority, provided only that the majority were suitably imbued with the importance of the doctrines of Fourier and St. Simon, as they now are of those of Calvin and Socinius. Upon the acknowledged basis of Congregationalism, any association, which professes a belief in the Christian Scriptures, may justly claim to be a portion of the visible Church of Christ. And being such, they may regulate all their movements by the mere vote of the majority. Their worship, their order and discipline, their ministry, are all under the absolute control of a simple numerical majority, from whose decision there is no appeal and no escape, but in a new separation. So that Socialism and Congregationalism, in their principles and order, are essentially alike. But at present, we admit, and rejoice in the fact, that in their creeds and their practices they are very far apart. How long this will be the case, it is impossible to know.

It has been, certainly, with no little of distrust, as to the benefits to be attained, that we have approached this subject. It may perhaps be true, that the doctrine of Reserve, put forth by the Oxford Editor of Froude's Remains, which teaches that some truths may lawfully be kept back, in our public teaching, such as would not be understood, and would therefore be liable to perversion, through ignorance or misapprehension; it may be true that that doctrine is applicable to this subject, if to any. But we do not so understand the duty of public teachers, even the ministry of the Church, much less that of Reviewers and public Journalists. Their maxim should be, to disguise nothing, to declare the whole truth.

We know, indeed, that there are some sores in the body politic, so deep and disgusting, that it is in vain to think of cure by any resort to the probe or the lance. The great hope is in the *vis medicatrix naturæ*, the recuperative energy of nature. It is true, doubtless, of the body politic, as of the natural body, that superficial eruptions are at once an indication of healthy life at the fountain, and at the same time a means by which that healthy action of the fountain is kept up and perpetuated. And it may be true also, to keep up the figure, that the sounding of unnecessary alarm will be more likely to do injury to the patient, than to relieve the malady. But when disease has progressed to a certain point, it becomes necessary to obtain relief speedily, or the case becomes desperate. And when we trace the progress of Association, in all its forms and developments, from the New Christianity of St. Simon, through the theory of universal harmony of Fourier, to the utter abolition of property, in the Communism of Proudhon, Louis Blanc, and their associates and coadjutors, and reflect that the influence of this system has already become too powerful in France, both for the monarchy and the Church, and that its friends boast that it is formidable in other European States, it seems to us that we are justified in treating even this utter absurdity, as it certainly is, as not unworthy of notice. It is the standing text of communism, that all private property is theft. "He who takes," says Proudhon, "a larger share than his neighbor, defrauds that neighbor, and must be compelled to restore what does not belong to him." And this spirit of spite, and envy, and hatred, against all the possessors of extensive property, is far from inert or unimportant, even in our own republic, although its operations are more covert here perhaps than in Europe.

We do not indeed suppose that the advocates of Association have any serious intention—certainly they cannot have any rational expectation—of ever being able to reduce their absurd theories to actual practice. It is, we apprehend, rather a covert war upon the existing order of things, than any well defined and practicable system in itself considered. It may possibly be true, that the founders of these systems, and whose names they long bore, were entirely serious in their pretensions. But it requires no great sagacity to perceive, that if they were serious, they could not have been wholly sane men. It may be true, perhaps, to some extent, that all reformers are enthusiasts, and this species of enthusiasm is not unlikely to produce a kind of idiosyncrasy, bordering upon monomania. But the insanity of these men was of a very different charac-

ter, unless we suppose them to have been, in part at least, mere impostors, low and vulgar hypocrites. The objection to this latter exposition is, that mere hypocrites are not likely, as a general thing, to infuse a sufficient degree of earnestness into their teachings to give them an existence, beyond that of their founders. And we think it but a fair deduction, from what we know of the founders of sects, religious and political, that the followers are far more generally obnoxious to the charge of insincerity and duplicity, than are the founders of those sects. This is, we think, especially true of socialism, communism, and all the varieties of Association. The idea of subverting the dynasties, and reforming the political fabrics of Europe, seems not much to have occupied the mind, either of St. Simon or Fourier. And if either, or both, expected any such result, it was expected as a consequence of the ultimate development of their principles, in a succession of generations, rather than as an end specifically aimed at, or immediately to be desired.

But the Associationists of this day, the Red Republicans of the French School, the followers of Louis Blanc and Ledru Rollin, care little for reforms, which are only to be accomplished in the slow progress of ages. They have prodigious little regard to the development of results, which are only to be felt by the unborn generations of the future. They look to the present hour, and are content to let the event trammel up the consequences, and are ready to jump the life to come. They desire men to break down barricades, to besiege the Tuilleries, to take and hold possession of the Luxembourg, to overawe and finally to disperse the Chamber of Deputies, and constitute and convene one more in accordance with their own spirit and temper. They have no taste, and no time, for forming phalanxes; for settling questions of industrial philosophy; for estimating the probability and computing the process of paying off the British national debt, by means of the eggs which might, and inevitably would, be produced, in the phalansteries, when the entire population of Great Britain should be distributed into 600,000 of these Associations, every one of which should keep 200,000 hens. For such absurd speculations they are content to let Fourier stand responsible, while they will use his name, and the skeleton of his scheme, for other and far different purposes.

They care nothing for the equal distribution of property. They have, in fact, no belief in any such mad scheme. And they care little for the abolition of the marriage relation and the consequent introduction of universal license and concu-

binage. They are, in fact, men of too much sagacity not to know that this must inevitably be the consequence of the annihilation, or great relaxation of the conjugal tie; and we do not believe that even these men, with all their recklessness and ferocity, are quite prepared to cut down all the restraints and protections of female purity, and introduce at once the disgusting state of utter prostitution.

And still you shall find these same socialist leaders parading the streets of Paris, at the head of a *sans-culotte* mob, bearing upon the waving folds of their uplifted banners, such significant inscriptions as these: "*A bas la famille*," down with the family! "*La propriété est un vol*," property is robbery!

Neither do we believe that the Red Republican leaders in France, who are almost to a man professed socialists, have any belief in the fitness of mere stone masons, who have not the remotest knowledge of the history, or the wants of the country, to become at once members of its legislative assembly. And still this was done in the case of citizen Nadaud, who, although a resident of Paris, and not known perhaps to a solitary one of his constituents, was caused to be returned to the New Assembly, for the department of *La Creuze*, a remote country district, where indeed stone cutting was a regular employ, in their extensive quarries. And this was done through the agency of the socialist committee. The same thing was, in effect, brought about through the same agency, which extends, by a kind of secret order, throughout all the departments of France, in the case of three or more sergeants of the army, who were returned to the New Assembly by constituencies, who, in fact, knew as little of them as they did of the inhabitants of Central Africa, or the mountains of the moon. *Commissaire* and *Rattier*, two of the number, were returned for the two great departments of which Lyons and Strasbourg are the capitals. And sergeant *Boichot*, who was actually under arrest for mutiny and insubordination at the opening of the polls, which was indeed his only claim to be brought forward, and the only ground upon which he was brought forward by the socialist clubs, and who was wholly unknown, except as a violent exciter of sedition, this wretch stood *fourth* on the list of representatives of the metropolis, by the votes of 128,000 persons.

In short, it is an acknowledged fact, upon all hands, that in France the Red Republicans, the Associationists, the Socialists and Communists, are but equivalent terms; and they constitute, at this moment, the uncontrollable majority of the French republic. And yet these men have no serious pur-

pose of reducing their absurd theories to practice. The theory of Association is indeed as hopeless, as to build railroads in the moon, or to make a lantern of the dog star! No man, in his senses, at least, no well informed man, for a moment believes any such thing. And still the promises and pretensions which these leaders put forth, no doubt have some weight with an infuriated mob, who are proverbially bereft of all sense, unless it be the sense of self-love, and its offspring, impatience of restraint. But, that the leaders of this movement have any serious purpose of an attempt to hold society together, upon any such plan, is too absurd to be supposed. The language of M. Guizot, is the universal sentiment, almost, of all those without the craft; and for the credit of humanity, one would hope, it might always be upheld. The "Social Republic," says Guizot, "is at once odious and impossible. It is the most absurd, and at the same time the most mischievous of all chimeras. But we must not presume on that. Nothing is more dangerous than that which has strength to reach what it is impossible to hold."

But, as we approach this dire chimera a little nearer, and inspect its pretensions somewhat more narrowly, we shall find that it possesses within itself the seeds of its own dissolution; and that, like all monsters, it is denied the power of reproduction. We are not inclined to doubt that M. Fourier was perhaps sincere, and seriously desirous of improving the condition of his race. But we believe, nevertheless, that he was so far excited by zeal, and so far enfeebled, and his powers so far impaired, by a morbid sensibility, at frequent disappointments, that he finally became distinctly a monomaniac; and that he went down to his grave, neither more nor less than a feeble, heartless misanthrope, a disappointed, insane old man, without near kindred, without sympathy, and without hope. However melancholy this view of his case may be, it is perhaps the most charitable one which can be taken of it, both for his credit as a philosopher, and his sincerity as a man, and a nominal believer in Christianity. Any other view must involve him either in the most stupid, the grossest of all imaginable absurdities, or else in the publication of the weakest falsehoods, the vainest, most idle dreams, which ever infested the brain of any mortal man.

As we follow out this investigation, it will become sufficiently apparent, no doubt, that socialism is, essentially and intrinsically, anti-Christian and pantheistic in all its principles, and equally so in all its practical developments. There is perhaps less, in the history of the Count de St. Simon, to



induce us to attribute his vagaries to positive and well-defined monomania, than in the case of Fourier. He began life as a soldier, and was, for many years, an officer of considerable grade, and some pretension, in the French army. He served in this country, during the last years of our revolutionary war, under Count Rochambeau, and was present at the siege and storm of Yorktown, as we learn from the article in the *North American Review*. As early as 1790, he entered into financial speculations, for the avowed purpose of raising funds to carry out his strange enterprises. He studied the arts in the polytechnic school, or under its professors, and then studied medicine in the best schools in Paris, and traveled extensively. He wrote upon politics, ethics, philosophy and the arts, and to close his eccentric career, put forth what he very modestly denominated the *Nouveau Christianisme*, or New Christianity, containing an exposition of his religious views. The leading features of his scheme are, that St. Simon was the veritable Saviour of mankind, the one chosen from the foundation of the world, to be the regenerator of his race, and before whom all other prophets and priests, even the Messiah, must bow. It seems to have been a kind of Mahomedanism in its religious teaching; but its reforms lay mainly in the line of industrial regulations, which promised to bring all mankind upon a level. These views would of course commend themselves to the indolent, the dissolute, the reckless, and the abandoned and hopeless of all kinds, from whatever causes. The new Christianity proposed to abolish inheritances, to divide property numerically among the whole population, educate all children at the common expense, and equally, until some particular tendency, or aptitude, should be developed, and then for the profession or pursuit thus indicated.

This doctrine had made very considerable progress, during the life of Fourier. And although the founder deceased, in 1825, soon after the publication of his *New Christianity*, in 1831 this sect numbered, among their supporters, the *Globe*, and some other newspapers of influence and with extensive subscription lists. They had, at this time, numerous assemblies, and had already split into many subdivisions, rallying under different leaders; but all sufficiently liberal towards the *esoteri*, and equally reckless and denunciatory against the *exoteri*.

As Fourier himself often went into their assemblies, and made very free comments upon their doctrines and practices, it may not be amiss to listen to his testimony, as his followers

will regard him as a reliable witness, and all must admit that he had great advantages for forming correct opinions upon these subjects, where his judgment was not perverted by any hallucination. The truth is, no doubt, that Fourier did possess too much penetration and discrimination, not to feel, at once, the absurdity of a great portion of the St. Simonian doctrines, and too much sense of justice, not to abhor much of its economical and moral spirit, and too great sincerity to disguise his sentiments towards them, or their measures. He is represented by his biographer, (p. 67.) as saying, "Their rough hewn dogmas are pitiful, yet they have an audience and subscribers." It is probable that Fourier saw clearly the absurdity of other idiosyncrasies, although ranging somewhat along the same line with his own, for he is most justly pointed and severe against the teaching of the St. Simonians. *Mutato nomine, de te fabula narratur.*

His biographer, (p. 76.) says of him, "After having been to one of the meetings, [of the St. Simonians,] Fourier wrote on the 28th of January, [1831:] "I was present at the Simonian preaching last Sunday. I can't conceive how these sacerdotal buffoons can get such a numerous following. Their doctrines are not receivable; they are monstrosities to make one shrug; think of preaching the abolition of property and inheritances, in the nineteenth century." And yet this same Fourier put, among the fundamentals of his own theory, a kind of partnership in property, among eighteen hundred people, which is, if possible, more absurd and impracticable, than the utter abolition of all property. It is impossible to separate the two systems, and, in practice, they have already commingled and coalesced.

In the appendix to M. Pellarins' pamphlet, p. 155 *et seq.*, we have Fourier's views of St. Simonianism, very much in detail. And as the author of the *Nouveau Monde Industriel* has some followers, in this country even, and in high places too, it may not be amiss to know what he thought of cognate systems. "To give you an idea of the weakness of their dogmas," says M. Fourier, "they pretend, that the late economist, St. Simon, was inspired of God, that there are three revelations, that of Moses, that of Jesus Christ, and that of the economist St. Simon. Is not this making systems with an axe?" And yet Fourier complains, that the Reviewers of his system brought the same charge against him of assuming to be inspired. And it is very obvious, from his own account of his system, if system that may be called, which consists of mere

fragments, and from the testimony of his biographer, that this charge, as against Fourier, was altogether well founded.

But he says farther, (p. 157,) "I do not conceive how any one can find credit in Paris, with such weak doctrines. They discussed and argued about confession, which they defended; and I would willingly bet, that of the eighty present, not one goes to confession, except from speculation in hypocrisy. They themselves believe no more in St. Simon, than in the Alcoran." After detailing many of their inconsistencies and absurdities, which will compare well with those of his own school, he adds, "It is impossible not to think, that the St. Simonians have laughed at these follies." "Such are the tactics of the Simonians, always a tutelary mask, a sympathetic gasconade. If you should let them have their way, if you depended on their simulated protection, you would soon be sunk by that very protection, which is a Judas' kiss." "They are not yet strong enough to persecute, and their general way is to flatter the man they wish to stifle."

Can it be said, then, that in denouncing the leaders of the last, or more properly the three last, French revolutions, the socialists, communists, and every species of Associationists, with the Red Republicans for their common bond of union, as mere pretenders, make-believe-adventurers for personal advantage, who have no serious purpose of reducing their industrial, or social theories, to practice, who are, in fact, Puritans by profession, and pirates in practice, and hypocrites in every thing; can it be said, that we thus judge them harshly? We do not intend to be more severe upon them, than simple justice requires, and we trust we have not exceeded the measure of recrimination, which they deal out to each other. And it is a saying, no more trite than just, that when rogues fall out, others may expect the disclosure of some precious truths! But we have one more testimony from M. Fourier, as to the benefit to be expected, in the final success of the theory of St. Simon, and we beg our readers to apply it, *in totidem verbis, mutatis mutandis*, to the entire scheme of Association, whatever guise or name it may assume.

"If the St. Simonian system should be organized," says Fourier, "you can be by no means sure *that any amelioration of the working classes* would be the result. The only certain effect would be, *to concentrate, in half a century, all the estates, capitals, dominions, mills, manufactories, in the hands of the new priests.* When the Simonians should have possession of every thing, they would know well how to TREAT THE PEOPLE, as all theocrats have treated them, from the

priests of Egypt and of Hindostan, up to those of the Roman church, who, at Rome, pillage every thing, make a monopoly of every thing."

Verily these men, when speaking of rival theories in reform, seem to comprehend well enough, where all such experiments, on common principles of humanity, must end. It is passing strange that they do not perceive, that the same thing is equally true of their own theories. If St. Simonianism, or Fourierism, could supplant Christianity, to-day, throughout the whole world, which is of course impossible, does any sane man suppose that mankind would enjoy more liberty? or more comfort? that their labors would be lessened, or their enjoyments multiplied? It seems scarcely possible that any sane man can be so absurd.

We know, indeed, that the advocates of these social reforms do not generally, in terms, propose to supersede Christianity, but only to graft a new and better system of social relations, and social operations, upon the present order of the Church. This may sound plausible enough, perhaps, to those who have already departed so far from the corporate life of the one Catholic Church, as to have wholly lost all just appreciation of its indispensable necessity, in order to perpetuate sound doctrine, and to keep up the life of God in the soul, through a succession of generations.

We say it with no spirit of vain-glorious exultation, but in pain and sorrow, that in looking back upon the history of New England, for the last fifty years, and recollecting what strange vagaries have, from time to time, taken possession of the Churches, and the Pastors, and how constantly, but almost imperceptibly, there has been kept up a manifest departure, in the very fundamentals, from the faith once delivered to the Saints, and which has nowhere been maintained so pure and undefiled, as within the pale of that one Church, which is the Body of Christ; in recurring to these monitions, which everywhere come upon the ear, from the past history of New England, we say, it would not surprise us if many, among the sects, or indeed most, with the exception of those bodies which have maintained either Episcopal or Presbyterial government, would, ultimately, fall in with one or other of these industrial, or social reforms. It seems to us, as we have said, wholly consistent with the doctrine, and with the order of these Church Associations, (for in conscience we can call the whole body of the Congregationalists nothing more,) that they should do so, at any time. We hope, indeed, for better things, but the lessons of the last few months admonish us to dread the

worst. The orthodox Congregationalists even, who contend so stoutly for their own soundness in the faith, seem to us to have no common bond of union, unless it be a succession of negatives, which are mere dead lumber. Generally they are not Unitarians, and again they are not Trinitarians, in the sense of the early Councils, or the four first Creeds of the Church; but extensively and positively, they are Sabellians! Then again, they are not Roman Catholics, they are not Catholics at all; their systems are not branches of the One Holy Catholic Church, or of the visible Church of Christ upon earth which the early Creeds define; but dogmatically and *positively*, their members are Calvinists, belonging to the invisible Church, or they were so sometime! They have no ministry but a self-constituted one, coming down, in unbroken succession, not from John Robinson even, who was once a Priest in the English Church, but from some distinguished personage, *who was himself* a LAYMAN. They affect to ridicule the succession of the ministry from the days of the Apostles, but they are very strenuous to preserve it, by succession, in their own self-constituted Associations! But we have no disposition to pursue this parallelism further. We have now done with St. Simonianism. We shall resume the subject of Socialism, in a future number, and examine it somewhat more in detail.

## LADY ALICE, OR THE NEW UNA.

ART. III.—*Lady Alice, or the New Una. A Novel.* D. Appleton & Co., New York and Philadelphia, 1849.

IN introducing this remarkable book to the notice of our readers, we beg them to understand, that it is not our intention fully or formally to review it; and therefore we shall say little or nothing about the plot of the story. We presume that most of them are somewhat acquainted with a production which has had already a very wide circulation, and has excited no little attention. In some quarters it has been highly eulogized as a most interesting, and even captivating work of fiction. It appears to us to be characterized throughout by unnaturalness, and the descriptions to be drawn out often in tedious detail.

The three prominent personages are, the lover, (Frederick Clifford, a Roman Catholic,) the lady Alice herself, and her uncle, the Rev. Herbert Courtenay, both belonging to the Church of England. These are evidently the author's standards of excellence. The two former, and especially the second, are represented as sustaining extraordinary trials, which are not so much disciplinary for their *personal* good, as vicarious and satisfactory for delinquences *not their own*. This appears from parts of the story itself, (p. 73, near the top,) and is distinctly avowed by the author, in the last paragraph of the Preface; and it seems to have a favorable bearing, whether intended or not, on the doctrine of meritorious penances, and acts of supererogation. He acknowledges that Clifford's conversion "proves" his own "private persuasion." It is therefore fair to infer, that *generally* and on *important topics* at least, he expresses his own sentiments through the medium of the hero and heroine of the tale. And this accords well with the lofty character in which he evidently intends to invest them. "The ideal perfection and purity, the innocence and strength which he has attributed to them," and which for himself he expressly disclaims, are chiefly moral, and in practice; and must not be confounded with the opinions, thoughts, and feelings, the whole intellectual and spiritual nature, which they are delineated as possessing and cherishing. The disclaimer is itself an endorsement of their excellence.

The book contains descriptions and illustrations which

would seem to be more in accordance with the medical profession than that with which rumor has connected the author. And it is probable that most readers of delicate feeling will regret the introduction of some. It is impossible, also, not to be struck with the fact, however much it may be regretted, that ideas are often presented in detail, where most minds would have been content with an indirect allusion, and when, in general, the course of conversation or current of the story, did not require their introduction at all. Numerous illustrations of this, will immediately occur to the reader. At present, let it suffice to inquire, where was Clifford's "ideal perfection" when he asked the lady Alice "tenderly, are you quite fit to dress yourself?" adding, "you are so very young that you might accept my assistance." (P. 8.)\* This *very young* girl, to whom the "pure and perfect" Clifford offers his services as dressing-maid, was *only* seventeen years and two months old, and the would-be-attendant at the lady's toilet was really six years older, though his appearance, being somewhat like that of *imberbis Apollo*, "you would hardly have guessed that he was turned of twenty-three!" (See p. 6, beginning of Chap. ii, and p. 11, end of Chap. iv.) The conversation took place in July. The only plausible apology for such a proposition would be her supposed state of exhaustion, and the impossibility of obtaining more suitable aid. To urge a six years' difference of age is preposterous, and would be rightly regarded by most young ladies as insulting.

The improbabilities and extravagances which abound in the book are really amazing. *Mademoiselle Louise de Belmont*,† (the illegitimate grand-daughter of a "strictly virtuous" (!) Italian "model," who poniards fatally a too bold artist whom she had accommodated in his studio,) refuses to marry the man whom she deeply loves, Augustus, the brother of Frederick, though urged by the strongest consideration that can weigh on a woman. Young and beautiful, she agrees to marry an old German Count, but draws back at the very moment that the ceremony is to be performed, and yet passes publicly, for a long time, as his wife, and bears his name. While in this extraordinary state of supposed wedlock, she courts, incognita in a gondola, the same Augustus; and though masked, easily gains his affection, and induces him to marry her, with the conditions of his not seeing her face, and of their parting instantly on the performance of the marriage

---

\* The references are to Appleton's cheap edition.

† Alias *Madame von Schoenberg*.



service, not to meet again, "it may be for years," until she pleases! And yet Augustus is very well bred, very well educated, very wealthy, and very sensible. The author speaks too of "the predominance of the moral sentiments in his organization, and" of his "high habitual regard for what was due to his own character, as a Christian and a gentleman," at the very time that he describes him as about "to keep his assignation with the fair unknown," her object being equally unknown with herself. And, moreover, he coolly tells us, that this predominance and regard "stood him instead of real self-government!" (P. 78.) Truly, one would like to know how the *want of self-government* is compatible with the *predominance of moral sentiments*, and a *high regard* for one's character as a *Christian*; and how such an *assignation* can be made to harmonize with the latter.

ALICE, the "perfect, the pure, the innocent," in consequence of a forced oath, consents to pass for a man, and both in dress and manner shows off the exquisite finely, being "attired in the highest style of French fashion." Very young, very beautiful, the veriest model of feminine delicacy, she maintains herself in Italy by drawing and painting;—does not hesitate to resort to the extremest means of improvement, however revolting to a female;—takes the very first rank as an artist, both in design and execution, speaking at the same time all the cultivated languages of Europe, and being in other respects most highly accomplished;—lives as a young man on the most familiar terms with her lover Clifford, while she completely deceives him as to her identity, though distinguished for his perspicacity, he all the while supposing that she had perished at sea;—after dining with him at a public hotel, and drinking more wine than she could well bear, visits her own and his family;—shows them her fondness for needlework, freely and unnecessarily displaying to them her talents in drawing and music, in both which they all knew Alice to excel, and only one of whom, the sister of Clifford, is able to detect her disguise, and she is easily persuaded not to disclose the secret;—talks to "dear Mr. Clifford in a low, sweet voice," of "unwittingly touching the chord of some painful memory," and of having a great deal of the woman in (his) mind as well as in the delicacy of (his) frame;—speaks to him of his loss of Alice;—to his remark, accompanied by "a tender smile, I can't help thinking what an exquisite woman you would make, laughs," and tells "with a witty simplicity, a *petite histoire*," of having been "at Paris more than once taken for a woman in disguise;"—argues with Clifford himself, and others, at a public table, on the

feasibility of a woman's passing for a man and deceiving everybody;—and, to cap the climax, pretends to be a Carnival mummer and then a Russian princess in St. Peter's at Rome, on a grand pontifical festival, entering with apparently the deepest devotion into the service, she being all the while an Anglican Church woman! And all this tissue of impracticable hypocrisies is represented as effected by the guileless "innocent," because she will not herself tell, nor allow her dearest female friend to tell, what would oblige her to break a forced oath, (her friend being under no such obligation,) while it would ensure her highest earthly bliss! *Credat Judæus Apella!* And will the author expound to his readers, how these difficulties and most palpable incongruities are to be done away or diminished by talking of the story as "half an allegory!"

A man who can write and publish all this, supposing of course that people of common sense will not laugh at it as beyond comparison more absurd than any fairy tale, will most likely feel no embarrassment in "doubting whether" a drowning girl, "conscious that she is sinking, would claim" a man's "aid by a faint shriek, if she had not observed him devoutly kiss a jeweled reliquary which he had taken from his bosom, and by that mark of piety had become inspired with confidence!" (P. 10.) Old Davy Dean's stern and inflexible rigidity dwindles into downright insignificance, when compared with this young lady's hesitation to have her life saved by any man who was not a devotee!

"We must use human means, Sir," continued Butler. "When you call in a physician, you would not, I suppose, question him on the matter of his religious principles?" "Wad I no," answered David—"but I wad though: and if he didna satisfy me that he had a right sense of the right-hand and left-hand defections of the day, not a goutte of his physaic should gang through my father's son."

Passing over the frequent hyperbolical representations of elegance of dress, splendor of furniture and ornament, offensive delineations of female beauty, (such as "floating golden hair like an archangel—eye large as a prophet's—lips controlled by a divine purity,")\* from which the author of the Arabian

---

\* The author manages certain protuberances of "the perfect mould of a beautiful head, and the faultless oval of a face," with considerable dexterity. For example: "*The delicate shell of an ear, which it would have been a sin to hide—the straight nose, harmonizing so perfectly with the face that you must have made an effort to observe its Phidian root, and the refined carving of its delicate nostril.*" One is almost tempted to ask whether queen Mab may not have played hide and seek with some of her maids of honor within the grottoes, smooth as the most transparent specimen of conchology and tinged with the pearl's own essence, of those openings, the sides of which were carved with so refined a nicety. The nose, particularly, has always been a hard feature for romance-writers and poets to deal with.

Nights might delightedly take a lesson, and which seem to prove what the author is capable of imagining, rather than what he has actually seen; we request attention to one or two indications, selected from multitudes, of sympathy with certain forms and ceremonies of worship, and also with certain doctrines which mark very definitely an attachment to the extreme of what has sometimes been called Puseyism, (whether correctly or not we shall not stop to discuss.) And we beg it to be borne in mind, too, that the selections were not made with any view of exposing the ultraism of the book, but are those which happened to present themselves on looking it over, and are confined to the earlier part.

"The ancient altar of stone, ascended by steps of the same material, had a front embroidered with gold and colors on white silk, its altar-cloth of crimson velvet not less richly wrought, and its pall of fine linen and lace. Its six massive candlesticks of silver still remained, and were filled with huge wax candles ever lighted at the hour of service. The duke, indeed, held lands on condition that this was not omitted."

This last remark, it might be said, is apologetic; but why introduce at all what may seem to need apology? Such a defence is inadmissible.

"A grand painting of the Nativity—a master piece of Cignani, was the altar-piece. Here, night and morning, entered in solemn procession a youthful choir, stoled and surpliced, and preceded by cross, thurible, and lights. Here matins and even-song were chanted, and the prayers intoned by Herbert Courtenay, who had a genius for music and a passion for that of the Church." (P. 14.)

Courtenay is represented by the author as a Church of England clergyman of the Oxford School.

Let us take a look at another Anglican chapel, in which this Church of England clergyman is a prominent actor.

"It was a long wainscoted room, with a ceiling carved in oak. It was adorned with large pictures of family scenes from the Old Testament. At the further end, upon a dais elevated by three or four steps, stood the altar, dressed with dark-green velvet embroidered in crimson and gold, and a cambric covering with a deep fall of costly lace. It sustained a massive crucifix of gold, wax-lights in golden candlesticks and flowers in precious vases. Suspended from the ceiling by silver chains, three lamps of the same material lighted the length of the chapel, and threw a soft clear light, as upon all the pictures, so upon a fine Marriage of the Virgin, by Guercino—the altar-piece."

---

Straight and crooked—long and short—prominent, turned up, and pug—Roman and Grecian—are the common, but unpoetical, epithets. We have read of some distinguished personage, whose landlady, as she said, could never *get over his nose*, for which he humorously gave as a reason, that *it had no bridge*. The renowned favorite of queen Anne,

—"*As folks declare,*

*Did always toss proud nostrils to the air."*

It is a comfort to read that the incomparable "Alice had a straight nose." Clarinelle's "was the *reverse* of aquiline, but it was *charming*."

The reader ought to be informed that the marriage service is about to be celebrated in the chapel so described.

"The child" (Alice) "kneels alone on the cushioned *prie-dieu*,\* and having said her prayer, kneels on, looking at the altar-piece."

"And now Herbert Courtenay, in the new and appropriate vestments with which the duchess had supplied the vestiary, stood at a lectern of antique form wrought in brass," &c. "The youthful choir sung 'Thanks be to God,' they confessed; were absolved," &c. "Thus prepared, all voices joined in the *chanter* creed; followed the *cadenced* suffrages, the *thrilling monotone* of the collects, the harmonious close of the *Amens*!"

We have heard of "very *genteel* worship," and our author tells us that in this connection took place one of "the *sacramental* acts of human life." (Pages 17, 18.)

Now let us glance at one of the doctrines of the author, which are evidently designed to accord with those of a certain school. Edith, who before the morning just alluded to, had eloped with her lover, held with him the following conversation. Not one syllable is lisped which might seem to imply that its dogmatical bearing is not in entire agreement with the author's theological system.

"If you are afraid of temptation, you should seek to strengthen yourself against it.' 'How?' 'You have been confirmed?' 'Yes.' 'And made your first communion afterward, I know.' 'Well?' 'Why not renew it? Why neglect now that means of grace?' 'Well, I can't say, (evasively,) that I am much tempted since I have loved you, Edith. You are my guardian angel. All I want is to have you always at my side.' 'True strength, dear George, comes from a higher source.' 'What a little saint it is!' thought D. 'Epiphany morning, there will be an early communion in the chapel *on my account*,† because it is my birth-day; and Lady, &c. are to receive with me. They are not my blood-relations at all.' 'And not your father?' 'Nor my husband,' said Edith, looking at him, and speaking in a very low voice. 'For that word's sake, dearest Edith, I will be there.' Which happened accordingly." (P. 15.)

We make no comment on the *motive* and *feeling* which is represented (and without a word of censure) as leading to this communion. We will only remark that the reader of Lady Alice cannot be surprised—although, if he has any right feeling, he must be shocked—at the frequent connection of (sublimed and spurious) devotion with bad passions of our fallen nature. This naturally leads us to notice another characteristic of this publication, namely, the union of the sensuous with the devotional. And this we regard as one of the most objectionable and revolting features of the book. If, in order

\* The reader who does not understand French, may be gratified to learn that this means a sort of desk to kneel on at prayers.

† Alice uses the same language—"partook with me, and in my behalf, of the bread of life." (P. 88.) It would really be in character with the associations of opposite things, which occur in various parts of the book, to say, that the author seems to regard such communions in the light of a *benefit* given especially to the principal actor.

to throw a clear light on this characteristic, we are compelled to introduce into our columns matter which may well be thought out of place therein, we plead the law of necessity, unconscious of being the offending party.

"On the morrow (after the communion mentioned in the passage before quoted) the flowers and lights are in all the palace of that princely race, to mimic on a northern night the sunshine and fragrance of a tropical noon; while the saloons are filled with a brilliant throng, little mindful of those matin sanctities, but intent to participate with what is, after all, a part of our nature, in the joy of a *mysterious commemoration*. For if worship be the union of man with his Maker, pleasure, rightly understood, is a bond of humble sympathy with our own kind. And in this sense, as there is a time to pray, so there is a time to dance. In her enchanting ball-dress, Edith rests a white-gloved hand on D'Eyncourt's shoulder; and she is young enough to be pleased with his uniform, which he becomes. His hand clasps a slender, rounded waist. This is before all the world; yet she looks in his face with the most unembarrassed smile;—in a moment they are whirling among the waltzers—'God has made every thing beautiful in its time.'"

Leaving the author to explain what "mystery" this dancing "commemorates," the reader cannot fail to perceive that the *whirling waltz* and the *clasping of the waist* are among the things that God has made beautiful in their time. And yet this divinely *authorized*, if not *instituted*, "pleasure before the world," leads to the same pleasure in private, and is soon followed by elopement. Yes, the saintly one, whom the learned, observant, and sagacious Herbert Courtenay represents as "having never forfeited the grace which she received in baptism," (p. 13,) elopes! "What piety enjoined in such a case," having been "already learned of" this same spiritual guide and casuist, "to whom, under the seal of confession, this secret had been imparted by both." (P. 16.) If it had been this writer's intention—which most certainly it is not—to give a practical illustration of the wicked abuses to which (as every reader of history knows) auricular confession has always led, he could hardly have succeeded better. Will our Church take warning, and by strong expression of disapprobation frown on this evil, or will she wait till the mischief is developed and the practice authoritatively recommended?

The author does more than apologize for Lady Edith, when he calls her "*error pardonable*," reminding us that "there are weaknesses which a woman would be 'less perfect' if she wanted." (P. 17.) This is bad enough, but what must any chastened Christian mind think of what immediately follows? "She threaded the intricacies of her embarrassing position with the certainty of a somnambula; or of a human spirit which has not forfeited by sin the mysterious guidance of its awful Familiar—the Spirit of God." (P. 17.) This associa-

tion is revolting and shocking. It is wholly at variance with a proper acquaintance with the nature of sin, as shown in Holy Scripture and felt by every true Christian. It fully illustrates how fundamentally erroneous and practically mischievous is that miserable system of divinity—a system at war with our standards—which inculcates on young people who have the good fortune to have been baptized in infancy, that they need only maintain the innocence that has been sacramentally secured to them. The peccadilloes which in high fashionable life can hardly be avoided—the indecencies of the waltz, with its various movements, positions developing the person, and manipulations, even if followed by clandestine engagements and elopements, are quite in harmony with the preservation of this most dangerous theory of baptismal grace. "God hath made *every thing* beautiful in its time"!

This abominable union of the sensuous with the devotional runs through and disgraces the book, which, as a whole, is a bold avowal that God and the fashionable world can be equally well served, and both in the very highest degree, whatever the divine author of our religion may have said to the contrary.

In this connection we may introduce what is perhaps the most curious sentence in the novel. It is set off under the name of philosophy. Far be it from us to deny its claims to the venerable appellation, for since the time of Locke and Newton, to say nothing of Bacon, and his old instructors, Cicero, Aristotle, and Plato, philosophy has become a mere Proteus, whose form you can mould as you please. It is perfectly pliable, that is, good-natured, (like some of the characters in this book,) or plastic, that is, susceptible of being shaped into what form you may like best. A popular philosophy, doubtless, and not the less acceptable! The author, observing that "a philosophical theory on amusements is a great want at present, in the absence of such a thing" undertakes to supply the deficiency. Hence the following most lucid definition, the innocent simplicity of which must recommend it to every unsophisticated mind. Before introducing it, we would remark, that the author seems to entertain a very sincere respect for the dance. In a representation of its "history in a series of paintings," which makes part of the description of a "new ball-room, angels are charming Adam into his deep sleep," (p. 85,) of course, by a lulling dance! But the definition.

"The dance [is] a formalization (immemorially) of that vague and irrepressible sentiment which, apart from definite wishes or individual preference, attracts the sexes to each other, combining it with art into a series of harmonized and regu-

lated actions, subjecting it to the obligation of concurrence with an influence that unites the simplest of sensuous, with the most refined of intellectual pleasures, and which thus permits it to be manifested unconsciously by the most modest, and enjoyed by the most pure—it is really as essential in its time and place as prayer (not for all alike, but) to maintain, as a general thing, the healthy tone and cheerful decency of social intercourse."

Did ever any one before write such a paragraph as this? What a sentimental, transcendental, æsthetic, intended—by a most amazing misnomer—for a harmonized "philosophical" definition of "THE DANCE!" What wonderful mystery can possibly be hidden within the profundities of this greatly desiderated "theory"? May we, who never dance, venture to explore, while we confess our want of experience?

The author's definition of *the dance*, then, so far as an uninitiated novice can discern, is to this effect. It consists of two parts, SENTIMENT, *severed* and *combined* in the manner and degree stated in the definition, and INFLUENCE, *uniting* the two sorts of pleasures therein mentioned; the former, (that is, the sentiment,) which in itself is vague and irrepressible, being obliged to concur with the latter, (the influence.) This sentiment is formalized, that is, we presume, wrought out into form and shape. Brought into this state, "it" (the dance or the sentiment, it is not clear from the language, which,) is "manifested unconsciously by the most modest," whether in the polka, waltz, or any other gyration or gallopade. It is certainly a happy circumstance, that these "most modest" dancers "manifest" the aforesaid "formalization" or influenced sentiment "unconsciously," and that it is equally "enjoyed by the most pure." How this thing, so "unconsciously manifested and enjoyed," how such an "immemorial formalization of a vague and irrepressible sentiment," can be "really as essential in its time and place as prayer, to maintain a healthy tone of social intercourse," is, to a plain man, to say the least, impossible to be understood. It would seem that dancing was originally neither more nor less than a natural manifestation of excitement acting on the physical frame, from whatever cause produced. The author's idea, that it has any reference to "a sentiment which attracts the sexes to each other," is willingly left to his own mental "formalization," in the confident belief, that where it originated it will remain, in silent repose, like a multitude of other imaginings, too deep or too difficult to be drawn up to the light of day. When Mr. Newman felt himself puzzled with some question arising out of his language about the real presence, he remarked, with great *naïveté*, that if people would ask hard questions, they must expect hard answers; and, of course, his was so hard as



to be unintelligible. Our philosophical novelist leaves the author of "development" far behind. The subject is simple, the definition inexplicable. But, seriously speaking, how melancholy is the thought, that a mere pastime for children's recreation, which some men and women of fashion have abused to excite and cherish the worst of passions, should be mentioned in connection with the sacred intercourse of the soul with God by prayer! Comment on such an association is not only superfluous, but would be impertinent.

We are aware that some of our readers may be disposed to put the question, and we freely grant not without a right feeling, "Why exhibit, with such particularity, matters of this sort, which seem inappropriate in a Church Review?" We answer, with the same feeling, and with a deep sense of the responsibility implied, because it is a duty which devolves somewhere or other, to place erroneous views and their practical developments directly before the eye of those concerned, in order that they may shun the contagion, or, if they will not avoid the deleterious atmosphere, that they may not perish without due warning. A useful notice of such a publication as that before us, must go somewhat into detail. A merely general one would be good for nothing. A writer, who unites the worship of the world and the service of God—who associates dancing and prayer—who, with the utmost coolness, suffers his prominent characters to put together strict virtue and naked women, yielding naturally enough to the temptations of their position—who represents illegitimacy and deceit in connection with goodness, purity, and perfection—would not scruple, if the usage of fashionable society required it, to apologize for the practice of dueling. The author may think that he avoids such an imputation by *denouncing* "modern dueling," in his "*vindication* of knightly chivalry;" but the connection in which his language is placed shows what is its natural bearing. A reprint of what he has voluntarily published, will enable the reader to judge for himself. We will only inform him that the duel takes place early in the morning after the night on which the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper had been administered to the "apparently dying Clifford." The Earl Stratherne, Lady Alice's half-brother, is one of the principals. Whether it be incidental or not, the fact is, that the *communion* and the *duel* are brought together.

"Whether the removal of one of the grave responsibilities which have hitherto attached to the actions of the higher classes in Christendom, can take place without endangering a principle that has hitherto separated the Gothic civilization from that of the East, and of pagan antiquity—the principle, namely, that the individual, though subject to the state, is never resolved into it—merits the consideration

of moralists and students of the higher politics. The reconciliation of the law of chivalry with the law of Christian love, is so little difficult that they may indeed be said so to oppose, as mutually to sustain each other—that is to say, they are, as it were, the polar manifestations of one living principle, now exhibiting itself as meekness, and now as self-denying courage; here showing the lamb-like nature, and here the lion heart; prompting, in the same individual, forgiveness of injuries and generosity to foes, and resistance to oppression, the defense of the oppressed. And, without confounding, in this vindication of the knightly character, (traditional though now it be,) any apology for the false code of honor and the miserable custom of modern dueling, it may be affirmed, unhesitatingly, that ‘God gave not men swords in vain,’ and that He meant them to be so used as to secure the awful seriousness of our life in this world, militant from the beginning to the end.”

It is quite consistent with this to make Lord Stratherne reply “gravely” to the question—“You don’t mean to throw away your fire, I take it?”—“Certainly not.”

Let us now, as the last particular to be noted, turn to Clifford’s conversion. The reader must keep in mind that Frederick Clifford is the very paragon of perfection. Four years before “he might have been turned of twenty-three,” “there was nothing that he could not do, no *tour de force* whatever that he could not execute,” if we take the word of his future sister-in-law; and from the author’s account of him, you can think of nothing that he does not know. His versatility of talent shows itself in devising and assisting to perform “a ballet” or *Ondine* “formalization,” (p. 66,) in reading Persian poetry, in “clapping” into his presence “China and Hindoo” servants, and in converting sound Protestants of the Anglican Church, and Oxford School to his own favorite popery. (P. 89.) Frederick Clifford is the beau ideal of perfection. Herbert Courtenay, the uncle of Lady Alice, who had “taken care that she should never be prevented by ignorance from joining in Christian worship,” (p. 27,) is so learned and accomplished, that a distinguished Italian ecclesiastic, “and able diplomate,” had expressed a wish to know him. Here—at the expense of an episode—we must show what sort of Christian worship good uncle Herbert had taught his niece to join in. The scene is a Romish cathedral at Milan; the principal personage, a professed member of the Church of England. “The lady was at the *benitier*. She dipped the tip of her finger in the holy water, crossed herself in the usual way, and moved on.” The good seed had fallen on a kindly soil. “A priest was saying low mass. A bell announced the consecration. The lady instantly knelt,” and afterward “crossed herself twice.” She behaves, doubtless, in all respects, in accordance with her teacher’s instructions, and of course secures the praise of Clifford, who had watched and followed her.

"Do you know that I am surprised to find you so good a Catholic?" "A daughter of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of England should be a good Catholic." "But I should not have expected her to conform so exactly to our usages. Had not I known who you were, I should have taken you for a devout and well-instructed Milanese." "My uncle Herbert has taken care," said Alice, "that I should never be prevented by ignorance from joining in Christian worship."

Now, while it is clear that the enthusiastic religionist had been initiated by the Church of England divine into the devotional usages of the Romish communion, whose services she evidently estimates higher than those of her own Church, and for which she does not scruple to leave the instructions of its ministers, (p. 29.) it may be doubted whether any pains had been taken to teach her Presbyterian, or Methodist, or other anti-Romish forms. As we do not know whether the careful uncle regarded these forms as properly belonging to "*Christian* worship," we must be content to remain in doubt.

The Rev. relative to whom lady Alice is so much indebted, visits Clifford, and a short conversation takes place. The host refers to his own agency in having converted his "tutor to the Church of Rome," (it might be expected that such a man would be "wiser than his teachers,") and with a charming simplicity tells his guest, "I want to see if the same arguments will have a similar effect on yourself."

The doubt expressed by the visitor is really most influential, and throws a flood of light on the result. "I fear I should scarcely listen to them with the same bias toward conviction." (P. 89.) The author does indeed deserve the honest thanks of every lover of truth for this intimation. Almost any thing may be admitted where there is an accommodating bias, and not one man in a hundred can rid himself of bias. Courtenay shows a true knowledge of human nature. The argument between him and Clifford is short and miserably imperfect. Bossuet and Claude, or Chillingworth, would have been amused at such a discussion. In a minute or two the tables are turned; the confident Romanist begins to doubt, and the result is, that he requests a list of books on the controversy, which he promises to "get and begin reading to-night." This is quite a pleasant illustration of his eagerness, and a plain confession of his ignorance. While the preparations would naturally lead the reader to expect a calm and dispassionate development of the great argument between Romanism and true Christianity, there is in fact nothing that is worthy of the name. It is all comprehended within a single page, and might be regarded as the most perfect mountain-deliverance imaginable.

But still this may be a very superficial view of the matter.

The profundity of the argument may have been accommodated to the depth of error to be drawn out and removed. The "conversion" chapter may, after all, be a clever illustration of the author's consummate ability to adapt his logic to the degree of difference between the religious systems of the disputants. Viewing it in this light, it is, most probably, the master-piece of the book. Where the quantity of error to be removed is comparatively little, it were folly to waste a great amount of effort. Alice, we are told, "accepted the dogmas of Clifford's faith apparently nearly as himself. She did not consider the doctrine of his Church heretical, nor its worship idolatrous." (P. 88.) On the contrary, she did not scruple to "*leave* the English chapel immediately after even-song, without waiting for afternoon sermon," in order to arrive "in season to take her seat in the Royal French Church," there to join in Roman Catholic devotions. (P. 29.) To the remark, "You don't scruple passing for a Roman Catholic, and I can't see how you differ from one," she replies,—"*So long as I am living beyond the jurisdiction of the Church of England; but the instant I set my foot on the British soil, or so much as on a British deck, I am, as ever, an Anglo-Catholic. I love and revere the Apostolic Church of Rome, and in these countries I avail myself, without scruple, of the means of grace which it offers.*" (Pp. 139, 140.) This accommodating spirit is wholly at variance with the condemnation of Romanism, which appears everywhere in the standards of the Church of England. But Alice was a ready pupil of her gifted uncle, and her training does him infinite credit. Courtenay's Anglicanism, and Clifford's Romanism, correspond in so many particulars, that a transition from one to the other is quite natural. One illustration of such correspondence is abundantly sufficient to show this.

"The frigid reasoning," says Clifford, "which refuses the mother of God a relative worship, such as Catholics universally render her, necessarily checks the pious instincts of the heart." (It is probable that the ancient idolators who "made cakes and burned incense to the queen of heaven," thought and felt in the same way.)

"The worship of the virgin," said Herbert, "is a beautiful and poetical feature of medieval Christianity, *with which I am not inclined to meddle.* Being not commanded, either directly or by inference, in the sacred books received by Christians, and not practiced in the earlier ages, it clearly has no claim to be considered an *integral element* of our religion. It seems to be a part of *natural* piety, carried, as I think you will allow, in some instances, to a superstitious and hurtful excess." Clifford slightly started. "My very thought!" he said to himself. "You have no interest," he added aloud, "but that of truth. Certainly, without candor, it is impossible to be truly wise." (P. 90.)

The wisdom herein contained certainly does not lie on the surface, and in the unfortunate absence of any intellectual bucket to draw with, we are reluctantly compelled to leave it at the bottom of the well. Clifford's love for Alice doubtless predisposed him to compliment her uncle's candor and wisdom, and to open his ear to instructions, the practical bearing of which was so agreeable. After all, it is evident that his conversion is no radical change from Popish errors, as, in his first letter to Mr. Courtenay, he only expresses his conviction "that the position of the Roman communion is untenable in England." (P. 98.)

Perhaps it will be said, in palliation at least, if not in vindication of the author, that it would be unreasonable to pronounce sentence upon a book from the sentiments and conduct of the characters therein depicted; that such a procedure would result in the condemnation of some of the best standard writers; that even Shakespeare could not pass such an ordeal; and that sacred Scripture itself contains many delineations of vice which can never, without the greatest unfairness, be regarded as indicative of its general character and tendency. Without questioning in any degree the truth and importance of the principle, we maintain that the cases are not parallel. The exhibitions of sin and error in the Bible, are well known to be in direct opposition to its leading characteristic, and stand forth as solemn warnings. They are examples of instruction, inculcating lessons of that truth and holiness with which the whole book so eminently abounds. The improprieties and indecencies, if you will, which occasionally soil the fair pages of Shakspeare, do sometimes indeed merit severe reprobation; but they are abundantly redeemed by the general character and tendency of those matchless productions, which, while they inculcate sound morals, exhibit sin in all its deformity, and, by their profound knowledge of human nature and inimitable excellence in developing and representing it, mark that master mind as the commanding genius of the world. Most of the false sentiments that appear in the great English bard, are uttered by those whom he does himself expose to the reader's scorn. Sir Walter Scott points out this characteristic of the immortal painter of men and manners, when, to the remark, "We have Shakspeare's authority for saying, that wine is a good familiar creature, and that any man living may be overtaken at some time," he makes his heroine reply, "Ay, but he places the panegyric and the apology in the mouth of the greatest villain his pencil has drawn."

But the apologist for Lady Alice cannot urge this plea.

Sentiments even grossly objectionable are advanced by some of its prominent persons, and conduct which, so far from being capable of vindication, ought not to be mentioned without reprobation, is coolly described at length without one word of censure, either in the immediate connection or elsewhere. We maintain that the tendency of the book is bad, and, but for overwrought extravagance, would be worse than it is. An author has no right to publish a work of improper or even doubtful tendency, and he cannot logically shield himself from censure by denying that he has advocated what bears such an imputation. And yet, from the benefit of even this flimsy pretext, this writer has excluded himself, by the eulogies that he has passed on the principal personages of his book.

In concluding this notice, there are two points to which we are particularly solicitous to direct attention, as we are apprehensive that there are indications among us by no means of doubtful character, which show the expediency, if not the necessity, of bringing them clearly before the Church.

The reader of *Lady Alice* cannot fail to be struck with the prominence given throughout to the external and the sensuous in public worship, and especially in the ornamental arrangements of the chancel. Indeed, this is so carried out to an extravagant degree of correspondence with the gorgeous decorations which set off the most pompous occasions of the Roman ceremonial, that the imitation becomes perfectly contemptible, if not disgusting. The author has overshot the mark. If his representations of certain chapels connected with the English establishment did truly describe any places of public worship under that establishment, it would be quite time for diocesan interference. But few readers will be disposed to regard them in any other light than creations of an excited imagination, luxuriating with unbounded license in that absorbing thought of exterior fitness which seems to predominate in his mind over almost every other consideration. It would be easy to fill columns with quotations to this effect. It is the topic on which he delights to dwell, and therefore he makes occasions to introduce it repeatedly. Indeed, after reading the descriptions in pages 41, 87, 88, one is tempted to ask in all seriousness—are these meant for descriptions of what really exists, or are they, with other similar things in the book, to be comprehended within “the Allegory” mentioned in the Preface? Be this as it may, we are furnished with sufficient evidence of the importance attached to such matters by the general tenor of the book. The chancel is the ornamented sanctuary, and the communion table is the sacred altar on

which is "celebrated the *august sacrifice*, (p. 147.) the great and tremendous oblation *in the holy Eucharist* of which the fathers speak." (P. 42.) The author should have said the fathers of *the fourth and following centuries*.

The evident bearing of all this is to inculcate a mistaken or Romish view of the Eucharist. No doubt the general tendency of the age is to disregard positive institutions, and thus to disparage the sacraments of Christianity. But it is an important question—is this the best way to counteract such tendency, and to effect what is so desirable, namely, a holy and religious regard for those divine institutions as elements of the Gospel of Christ, and means and channels of His grace? And we are compelled to answer in the negative. Truth is not to be gained by running from the extreme of one error to the extreme of another; from carelessness and cold disregard to childish superstition. Whatever gray, wise medical heads may think of the homœopathic principle,—*similia similibus curantur*,—the theological faculty will certainly pronounce it anti-puritan. The "position" laid down by Cartwright and opposed by Hooker, "is, that *evils must be cured by their contraries*." And the extravagances which show themselves, in our day, among a few ultraists, may well suggest the inquiry, have they not, by the natural tendency of extremes to meet, gone back, in no slight degree, to the Puritanism of Elizabeth's reign, and in defending the farthest remove from Presbyterianism, and by introducing a system excessively ceremonial, run unawares into the very regions which, of all others, they would have wished to avoid. "The cure of the Church infected with poison must be done with that which is thereunto as contrary as may be," said the *old Puritan*; and so says the *modern ultraist*. Now, "we," says the *really wise man*, "we are contrariwise of opinion, that he which will perfectly recover a sick and restore a diseased body unto health, must not endeavor so much to bring it into a state of *simple* contrariety, as of *fit proportion* in contrariety unto those evils which are to be cured. The first thing, in skillful cures, is the *knowledge of the part affected*; the next, of the *evil which doth affect it*; the last is not only of the *kind*, but also of the *measure of contrary things*, whereby to remove it. They which measure religion by dislike of the Church of Rome, think every man so much the more sound, by how much he can make the corruptions thereof to seem more large."\* To apply this to the case in hand, we have only to

\* Hooker, Book IV, Section 8, Vol. I, pp. 457-8. Oxford ed, 1793, 8vo.



substitute Geneva, or some such name, for Rome. *Mutatis mutandis*, judicious Hooker's arguments are opposed to absurd extravagances in all ages, and of course to ultraism in ours. And here we cannot but stop and ask, whether,—by extraordinary elevations of the platform of a chancel; by profusion of symbolical and mystical ornaments; by substituting a closed altar, whether made of wood or stone, for a holy table; by scrupulously employing the former name and scrupulously avoiding the latter; by carefully turning the face to the place where the divine presence is supposed especially to be, whenever in public worship this can be done; and by so constructing the prayer-desk to be occupied by the officiating minister that he must so turn;—there is not at least some danger that a clergyman may, unconsciously, indeed, and with the best of intentions, but yet effectually, present to his people erroneous views of the Lord's Supper, and prepare for the reception of the notion of a *corporeal* presence, which the Church of England, in the clearest possible terms, expressly repudiates.\* *Obsta principiis*. Let those who would avoid the rocks of Scylla, beware of the whirlpool of Charybdis.

The other point suggested for consideration, is the danger of suffering any approach to simulation in religious profession. By this remark it is not intended to charge this, even indirectly, on the work before us. The feelings, aspirations, and doctrinal views of its leading *dramatis personæ* are quite clearly developed, and, if we perceive in them more of the artistic and poetic *sentiment* of religion than of its uncompromising and consistent *principle*, we must give the author credit for an honest exhibition of them. His *religieuses* are "passionately fond of dancing" and the gaieties of high life; and, as "Lord Maltravers observed, Lennox house is the centre of *fashion* as well as of *piety*." His Anglicans make no attempt to conceal their *sympathy* with the Church of Rome, and, indeed, do not scruple to acknowledge a *preference* for some of its peculiarities;† and his convert remains, in a good degree,

---

\* In a notice appended in the English Prayer-Book to "the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper," it is stated, that "the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and *not here*, it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."

† The passage on which this remark is founded contains a "development" of *opinion* and *purpose*, so felicitously brought out, that we cannot forbear giving it to the reader. The conversation is between the two lovers:—"Perhaps I do wrong to say such things to you; but does not your own ritual seem tame and naked after ours?" "If my mother," said Alice, "were not so beautiful and interesting as the mother of one of my friends, I should still love her a great deal more. But our rite too is beautiful. I own," she added, her eyes gazing into his with

a Romanist. These personages evidently show what they are in religious profession and faith. But an honest openness of character, making the whole man translucent, as it were, cannot be said to appertain to them. It is Alice herself who affirms the Jesuitical axiom that "*the divine result hallows the indispensable means*," (p. 124 ;) and although her remark is limited to "art," the lady's practice on *this* and various *other occasions*, proves that she did not intend to confine the application of so convenient a principle to the use of the pencil. "The sentence of society," she tells us in another place, "is too dreadful not to be avoided by *every innocent concealment*," (p. 71 ;) and the author represents her as "forced to become a *guileless deceiver*." (P. 141.) Into what extravagance of dissimulation she permits herself to be carried, has been before stated, and it needs no argument to show the inconsistency of her course with the apostolic direction to *be true in all things*. And further, although it may be conceded that the prominent persons in the fiction do honestly avow their religious convictions, it is nevertheless very evident that they are not candid and conscientious members of the Church of England. If there can be any such thing as denunciation, in plain language, not to be mistaken, of certain erroneous doctrines and mischievous usages of Rome, it is undoubtedly to be found in the religious standards of that Church; and these, its members are presumed to regard as authoritative, and its ministers as binding. To embrace and cherish such doctrines, and to pant after, or cling to, such usages, and at the same time profess to regard her as a spiritual mother, and to feed both soul and body at her fountains of life, is neither honorable nor honest. That we have among us some individuals—it is believed that the number is small—who are desirous of approximating nearer to the Church of Rome than the principles of the English reformation and the doctrines and practices settled by the English reformers would allow, is unquestionable. And that within a few years there have been

---

childlike fearlessness, "that I weep sometimes over the wall of Zion that is broken down, and when I can't help seeing the marks of the spoiler in the very sanctuary. And there are those, dear Frederick, who are doing something more than weep, who are beginning to rebuild. Even I hope to aid, one of these days, in so holy an enterprise."—"To think of all the wonders of religious art, once existent in England, which a barbarous fanaticism has destroyed!" "Yes," said Alice, with an expression of sadness succeeding to the animation of the moment before; "but it is better, don't you think, dear Frederick, to break the beautiful windows, than to *pervert holy doctrines and rob us of the consolations that God intended us to have?*" "And who, Alice, do you think, has done so?" "I was thinking," said Alice, rising to go, "of my own Church. I mean, that *she has suffered worse things* than the defacing of her sanctuaries." P. 27. The last remark is clearly explanatory of the former.

men wishing to enter the ministry of our Church, with Romish prepossessions and preferences, is matter of history. If some would-be-reformers desire to merge our constitutional peculiarities into an Erastian latitudinarianism, others again are no less desirous, by the help of a different latitudinarianism, to allow the advocacy of transubstantiation, and other errors condemned in our Prayer-Book. Let us plainly denounce any attempt to show that such an all-embracing accommodation is compatible with the plain and undeniable meaning of our standards. It is not true. The honest man, who holds the doctrines and likes the usages of Rome, will not belong to a Church which likes neither, and pointedly condemns some of both. An outward accommodation to prevailing views and practices, while in positions which seem to require it, with the purpose of exerting influence in an opposite direction, is one of the worst developments of Jesuitism. It is doing or yielding to evil that good may come, and will be as truly scorned by an honorable mind, as it is plainly condemned by APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY.

## ART. IV.

## CHARTER OF THE MASSACHUSETTS BAY COMPANY,

AND

KING CHARLES THE FIRST.

WHEN King Charles, the Martyr, bestowed a franchise upon a Company, mercantile in character, but missionary in design, he little thought that he was planting the germ of Republicanism in the New World. Beholding the project that was then forming in the English Church to extend Her borders over his dominions in the West, with the favor of a truly Catholic mind, he willingly added the weight of his prerogative to an enterprise which, it seemed, must draw down a benediction from Heaven. Had he foreseen that his gift would be perverted to a disloyal purpose, that in a few years the parchment which contained merely an act of incorporation would be sold into the hands of his enemies, and, borne over the ocean into the wilderness, would be set up as the constitution of an independent State, he would have hesitated ere he allowed the great seal of England to stamp it into life. But could he have looked further into futurity, and beheld the rising England of the New World perpetuating the glories of the Mother Country, protected by the laws of the Saxons, the Danes, and the Normans, and enlightened by the religion which St. Augustine professed, doubtless the pious monarch would have furthered the schemes of the uneasy Puritans, and rendered their secret intrigues unnecessary.

We who are only in a transition state, can see how good is finally to come out of evil. The Church is grasping in Her embrace the great empire of the West, and Her garments are unstained by the blood of the aborigines, while Her reputation is untainted with the guilt of disloyalty. Puritanism has been working for Her advantage. Fraud, violence and cunning; enterprise, daring and self-sacrifice; the vices and virtues of the Puritan-pilgrims, have prepared the way for the nobler, the only true Christianity. From the bigotry of a few have arisen the blessings of the many. The guiding wisdom of Omnipotence is now discernible beneath the shallow surface of human fanaticism. Regeneration, the voice which waked the pagan slumbers of the Old World, was to be the genius of a new creation here. The painted

savage was no longer to tread his forests in the simple majesty of his nature and strength. His shrill war-whoop was to be echoed back by the thunder of cannon, and his native cunning was to become powerless before the art of civilization. His woods were to be prostrated, his game annihilated, and his wigwam deserted; and he himself was to be driven before a power he understood not, further and further towards the setting sun, until the waves of the Pacific received the last remnants of his race, and his existence had become but a name. A new day was to dawn upon the West, a day carrying with it all the blessings of Christianity. There was to be there a new Heaven and a new earth, and the Cross of a true Faith was to be erected upon every spire, and reflected back to the sky by every lake and stream.

Such is the philosophy taught by the true understanding of the past. We search in vain for a reason for the bloody traces of civilization, unless it can be found here. The greatest achievement of art is but a poor equivalent for the happiness of a single family of savages, if it reaches no farther than the external and material world. A civilization which is crimson with blood and reeking with fraud, would be but little worth, if it comprehended nothing beyond the creations of steam and the magic of the telegraph.

We propose to make some inquiry into the origin of the most energetic colonization the world ever beheld, that of Massachusetts Bay. That this subject has been curiously distorted alike by doctors of law and history, the sequel will show, and we think that our examination of the original authorities will prove that we are indebted for the groundwork of this fair New England picture, not to the magnanimity of Puritanism, but to the zeal of the English Church. Of the historians who have dealt with this subject, Grahame and Bancroft occupy the most false and partisan attitudes. Grahame, educated in the narrow school of the Scottish Kirk, possessed a mind so warped by prejudice and so infected with bigotry, that his prolix history is false alike in fact and principle. He beheld the world through a Calvinistic mist. The most depraved exhibitions of Protestantism had attractions for him, and with incredible assurance he can assert that those fanatics, the Brownists, were the most loyal of the English people, as well as the most pious, virtuous, and courageous.\* He magnifies the virtues of the hardy pilgrim, and distorts with equal complacency the faults of the govern-

---

\* Vol. I, p. 180, 2d edition.

ment towards which the pilgrim displayed not disloyalty merely, but rancor and malice. He sneers in execrable taste at James I, for assuming the style of "sacred majesty:" forgetting the anointed character of the Princes who then sat upon the throne of England; and also that not a successor of John Knox "beats the drum ecclesiastic" in his beloved Kirk, who does not appropriate to himself with scrupulous care the title of "reverend." He carps at such "heathenish customs" as the drinking of healths, but passes over the atrocious crimes of Puritanism with gentle rebukes. He sees nothing excellent but in some form of dissent. He belongs to that class of Protestant writers who consider worldly prosperity as a sign of heavenly benediction. He fully believed in Cromwell's maxim, that the Lord's people are to be the head and not the tail, and that any means are justifiable to obtain this head-ship. A malignant hater of the Stuarts, a bigoted enemy of the Church, a zealous apologist for the crimes of Puritanism, and with all this neither an impartial, or thorough, or truthful relator of facts, he was totally unfit for the high office he assumed of teaching the world by examples. He wrote not for the world, but for New England; not for the New England of the present, but for that which has long since passed away. And he had the bitter mortification of living to see the America he so much worshiped, repudiate his gift and accept a more genial offering from one of her own sons.

As Grahame sees nothing excellent except in sectarianism, so Bancroft acknowledges nothing to be bad, unless it emanates from kingly institutions. He hates the Stuarts because they used, but more because they had, prerogatives. It is not the tyrant merely, but the KING, which brings out the venom of his pen. Radicalism, pure and unadulterated, that species of radicalism which beholds nothing bad in the many, and little that is good in the few, seems to be the ruling impulse which animates his labors as a historian. To have gained his approbation, a King must have undermined his throne, and a Bishop have broken his crook. The walls of a ballot box are large enough for his philanthropy, and that species of liberty which consists in compelling the few to submit to the many, *brings down* his apotheosis. A "press free even to dissoluteness," is one of the merits which he claims for an advancing civilization.\* As he writes not to let the past speak for itself, but to bend it to support his own theories, so he does not

---

\* Vol. II, p. 270.

scruple to identify himself with any party or system, however contradictory, if he can thereby promote his own ends. With the Quakers he can "*thee*" and "*thou*;" with the Puritans he out-Puritanizes Cromwell; with the Anabaptists he can kiss the dust under the feet of Roger Williams with a more superstitious reverence than the humble Papist in a better spirit bestows upon a nail-paring of St. Peter; and with those noble missionaries who bore the white lily and the cross among the terrible warriors of the Five Nations, he can condescendingly become a hero and a martyr. These do not contradict his favorite philosophy. But, on the other hand, whatever is good and holy in the conservatism of the Church, and whatever adds strength and grandeur to the pyramidal structure of civil and social communities, meets from him with untiring assault. And thus it is with this writer that an apostolic faith becomes mouldy tradition; that a kingly government and a loyal obedience are transformed into tyranny on the one hand and slavery on the other; and that a gradual scale of social order is distorted into an odious antagonism between the few and the many. His hatred of loyal old England is the characteristic of his work, and he seeks with unbecoming eagerness opportunities for digression, in order to indulge in his favorite theme. So far is he carried away by this hostile spirit, that he perpetually violates the rule of the *res gestae* in his descriptions and illustrations, without making any allowance for the circumstances of time and place. Thus, in describing the treaty of Utrecht, he refers those of its provisions relating to the slave trade in favor of England, to the promptings of bad hearts and unscrupulous avarice, rather than to the faults of the time.\* By the light of a clearer day England was the first nation to repudiate the system which preyed upon helpless Africa, and as if to show her shame for the past, she has gone to the other extreme. This is merely one instance of many, and we have not space in this connection to go more into detail. The candid inquirer who is unaffected by that worst of all cant, the cant of New Englandism, will judge for himself, in spite of common school falsehoods, and fourth of July hyperboles. He will not allow himself to be coaxed or threatened into the support of popular errors, even though they should be stamped with the counterfeit of truth by judicial decisions,—and doubtless his convictions will gain fresh strength, as he proceeds, that the history of the Western Republic is yet to be written. In the meantime let us calmly

---

\* Vol. II, p. 232.



review the character of the enterprise which led to that most important event for Europe and the world, the settlement of Massachusetts Bay.

The discoveries of Cabot had given England a title to the North-Eastern coasts of America, and her people were in possession of a field which afforded ample room for the most active enterprise. But no individual effort was sufficient to overcome the obstacles in the way of colonization, and combination was finally resorted to as the only feasible method. The signal failures of Sir Walter Raleigh in Virginia, seemed to prepare the public mind for those huge monopoly companies which shortly after engrossed nearly the whole of British America. King James divided all that part of North America between  $34^{\circ}$  and  $45^{\circ}$  of latitude, into two grand divisions, the Southerly of which he bestowed upon a London Company, and the Northerly upon a Company formed in Plymouth and Bristol, (1606.) The forbidding nature of the soil and climate of New England was not at that time known. On the contrary, that territory being within the same parallels of latitude which comprise the Southerly parts of France and the more Northerly of Spain, was supposed to be as fertile in soil and as mild in climate.\* And this natural supposition became highly colored by the accounts received from adventurers. The romantic voyage of Gosnold particularly, made under the favorable influence of the summer solstice, (1602,) raised the expectations of the public and excited the warmest hopes. His discoveries seemed to have revealed a land where beauty and plenty struggled for the mastery. As he entered Massachusetts Bay, he beheld it "encompassed all around, even to the very sea, with sweet smelling woods," and many "monstrous fishes" sporting in its waters. Further on, the earth was splendid in its gay mantle of green, interwoven with berries and flowers; the woods teemed with "living creatures and wild fowl," who fearlessly made their homes in "these ends of the earth;" the air sparkled with the plumage of beautiful insects and birds; while the landscape was musical with the distant sounds of running waters, to whose medicinal springs the halt and maimed might repair, and "leave their crutches upon the adjoining trees." Besides, who could tell what mines of precious ores lay hid in the bowels of the earth?†

---

\* Gorges, in his *Description of New England*, accounts for the coldness of its climate "partly by reason of the nearness of the sea, the mounting of whose waves break the reflection of the sun beams."

† Hubbard. Neal. "The country of the Massachusetts," says Capt. Smith, "is the paradise of all those parts; for here are many isles all planted with corn, groves, mulberries, and salvage gardens."

Such were the visions of the Northern Company, mingled with hopes of the advancement of religion, the enlargement of the empire and the increase of trade, when King James, an ardent lover of colonization, with royal munificence bestowed upon them the Northerly part of his dominions in the New World. Yet the attempts made by this Company to settle their territory were only partially successful. The stern band of Robinson alone, disgusted with their quiet condition at Leyden, where they suffered the evils of exile without any of its glory, founded by singular chance the famous colony of New Plymouth, in the territory of the Northern Company. Even the exiles of Leyden were influenced by the prevailing spirit of the times, and some fancies of suddenly acquired wealth cheered their farewell to "dear England," and mingled with their hopes of Heaven.\* But failures could not discourage the ardent love of adventure which actuated all classes of society. Ship after ship spread its white wings for the West, freighted with ambitious dreams of vast wealth and growing empires. The subject assumed a new charm when the sea opened to view the great variety of its finny inhabitants, equally pleasing to the eye and the palate. Hooks and lines were a more simple apparatus than charters and monopolies, and were within the reach of the poorest subject. The humble treasures of the ocean, if not so precious, were at least yielded with more readiness than the gold and silver of Mexico and Peru; and the wondering eyes of the natives soon beheld the promontory of Cape Ann covered with stages, upon which were cured the vast numbers of fish that seemed to leap from the sea at the command of the English fishermen.

Encouraged by this new source of wealth, and jealous of the violations of their monopoly, the Northern Company resolved to strengthen themselves by obtaining a fresh grant from the King. A new patent passed the seals, (1620,) reorganizing the company as the council for the affairs of New England, the corporate power of which was to reside in Plymouth. This "Grand Council of Plymouth" was no longer a mere company of merchants; it was composed of the great men of the kingdom, whose resources it was supposed would enable them to overcome readily the obstacles of nature, and whose names would be sufficient to inspire trespassers with awe. The designs formed by this Council were in the high-

---

\* Winslow's Brief Narrative, and Morton's Memorial. What profits do you intend, asked James of the Pilgrims, when they applied for a charter? and on being told *fishing*, replied, "So God have my soul, 'tis an honest trade; 'twas the apostle's own calling."

est degree magnificent, but were wholly unsuited for the wilderness, and they illustrate very forcibly the little progress that had then been made in the principles of colonization. It is impossible, however, to predict with certainty, what would have been the result of their undertaking, for their plans were frustrated by Sir Edward Coke, at that time Speaker of the House of Commons, and champion of "the liberties of the people." The aged lawyer, who was opposed to all monopolies, was especially hostile to the Council of Plymouth, and had sufficient influence to cripple their resources. They advanced no further in their plans than to send over Capt. Robert Gorges, with "a modest and prudent priest,"\* who was to superintend the affairs of religion in the colony, and aid in protecting the poor natives from the wrongs and abuses that were already practiced upon them by adventurers. But although Gorges was created a Lieutenant General, endowed with a principality of three hundred square miles, and invested with large powers of office, he soon threw up a commission which had more of name than substance, and returned home in disgust, (1623.)

Thwarted so soon in the extensive scheme they had formed for the establishment of a royal province in New England, the Grand Council abandoned an undertaking which originated in imagination, rather than reason. The failure of this enterprise must have had a chilling effect upon the romance of colonization, but it opened a door for schemes of a more humble and practicable nature. In the same year in which Gorges returned home, some merchants in the West of England, who had fished for cod and bartered for furs in the region of Massachusetts Bay, conceived that a colony might be planted on that coast, "to further them in those employments."† Such an expectation was not unreasonable. It appeared not only feasible, but prudent, to leave the supernumeraries of the fishing vessels, when the season was over, at some eligible point on the coast, where, until the next season commenced, they might barter with the Indians, and, by moderate cultivation of the soil, produce fresh provision for the ships when they again arrived. A company on this basis was readily formed, and a capital of £3000 subscribed. But the time had not yet arrived for the colonization of Massachusetts Bay, and after repeated disasters, this company shared the fate of its predecessors, (1626.)

---

\* Mr. Morel. Grahame says that he had the office of a Bishop. Does he mean that he was consecrated by the "Grand Council"?

† White's Brief Relation.

But now began to arise a new motive for action. The success of the Jesuit missions in every part of the globe was the subject of general wonder and remark. The disciples of Loyola had penetrated the wilds of America, and reached the sources of the Ganges, while the enemies of Rome were ridiculing holy-water and scoffing at relics. A rational fear began to be entertained that the pagan world, with its countless inhabitants and vast wealth, would soon acknowledge the sway of the Pope, while Europe was disputing whether he was the Man of Sin, against whom are directed the awful denunciations of the Holy Apostle. The reproach conveyed by reflections of this nature accompanied the enthusiast in his daily walks, and furnished ample topics for discussion in his social visits. The honor of the reformed religion appeared to be at stake, and why could not an effort be made to redeem its character?\*

This subject had often been debated at Dorchester, a town which, from its maritime spirit, had been the source of much commercial adventure to America; and among its most active supporters was John White, a priest of the English Church.† By his zeal, the cause of missions was united to hopes of gain, and though a connection so unnatural could promise but feeble results, yet funds were necessary for a trial of the scheme, and these could only be obtained by the inducement of profits. The gallant band of "knights, gentlemen, and merchants," which embarked in the project, six only in number, procured from the Grand Council of Plymouth a grant of territory extending from three miles north of the Merrimac to three miles south of the Charles, rivers, and east and west from the Atlantic to the *South Sea*, for New England was then supposed to be, like the Mother Country, an island. Having thus laid a sure foundation for the intended work, they "imparted their reasons, by letters and messages, to some in London and the West Country," (1627.) Although the disasters of former companies were still fresh in the public mind, yet such was the love of adventure then rife in the commercial world, that many capitalists offered to subscribe, if proper persons could be found "to undertake the voyage." Inquiries were accordingly made, which led to a negotiation with "Master Endecott," one of the patentees, a man "well known to divers persons of good note," and who "manifested

\* Mather. "General Considerations for the Plantation of New England." Dudley's Letter to the Countess of Lincoln.

† White, though not an ultra Churchman, conformed, says Wood, "both before and when Archbishop Laud sat at the stern."

much willingness to accept the offers" that were made to him. The ready compliance of Endecott was a happy omen. Of moral reputation, and well acquainted with the forms of business, he appeared equally fitted to superintend the cause of missions, and to protect the interests of trade. No further difficulty was experienced in obtaining subscribers to an enterprise which was to raise up "a new colony upon an old foundation," and, in the summer of 1628, Endecott was despatched to New England, with a handful of servants, to lay a basis for future operations.\*

But one thing was wanting to give completeness and unity to this Company with a double aspect. Composed of persons some of whom had in view the eternal welfare of the Indians, and others their own temporal gain, there was danger of imperfect action and misunderstandings, in the prosecution of objects so dissimilar. To obviate such difficulties, and to quiet their title, which, owing to the former grants of the Grand Council, was somewhat clouded, they determined to obtain a royal charter of incorporation. King Charles, generally unfavorable to the government of distant colonies by mercantile companies, was impressed with the novelty of a design which comprehended the enlargement of his empire, the extension of the Church, and the advancement of the national commerce. Puritanism had not yet expressed itself as a separate spiritual system, and a successful mission would redound to the glory of the Church and the honor of the throne. With such generous expectations, "a patent was granted, (March, 1628,) with large encouragements every way, by his Most Excellent Majesty."†

The appointment of officers, in the first instance, was reserved to the crown, and Matthew Cradock, who was more largely interested in the enterprise than any other stockholder, was nominated the first Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Company. The accounts received from Endecott, whose expedition had been sent out as an experiment, were of an encouraging nature. He had planted his little colony at the head of a noble harbor, of easy access from the sea, and central among the tribes, who were expected to resort thither for barter and instruction. Measures were at once taken to conduct the affairs of the Company with vigor. The shares of the stockholders were proportioned, and new subscriptions were obtained. A reinforcement of planters and laborers

---

\* Chalmers. White's Brief Relation.

† White's Brief Relation. Hutchinson. Mather.

was procured, and the services of several missionaries were engaged. Experts were enlisted who were skilled in minerals, and throughout all the operations of the Company, the same double aspect of religion and worldliness was curiously exhibited.\* Letters of instruction were addressed to Endecott, advising him of these proceedings, and urging upon him, in singular connection, to promote the commercial and fishing interests of the Company, and to bring the Indians to the knowledge of the gospel. From these instructions it appears that they placed little confidence in the morals of Endecott's servants, who were much addicted to drinking, smoking, and swearing, and whose example they feared would have a bad effect upon the Indians.† Thus early was experienced the absurdity of carrying on at the same time, and by the same Company, the sale of gin and the spreading of the gospel.

In pursuance of the plans of the Company, three hundred persons, among whom were four missionaries, and several gentlemen who were to act as Endecott's council, sailed from the Isle of Wight in the month of May, and arrived safely at Salem in the latter part of June, 1628. But Endecott soon found that his situation was not devoid of difficulty. In his despatches to the Company, he loudly complained of his interloping countrymen, and of their irregular trading with the Indians. His own authority being insufficient to check such violations of their monopoly, he begged the Company to take the subject into consideration, and to use some speedy means for suppressing the evil. Alarmed for the security of their rights, the stockholders determined to petition the King for a renewal of the royal proclamation of 1622, which forbade persons to intrude upon the franchise of the Plymouth Company, and in the month of Nov., 1628, their petition was granted, "with other beneficial clauses."‡ To this point we are able to bring the early history of the Company, without discovering any claim made by its members to rights or privileges of a sectarian character.

But a new source of trouble soon arose. From the earliest organization of the Company under the charter, its mercantile seem to have predominated over its missionary interests. Out of a dozen or more meetings of the corporation and directors, not more than one or two had any reference to religious purposes. The stockholders seemed always more

---

\* Early Records of the Company. Prince.

† Letters to Endecott. Johnson.

‡ Hazard. Early Records of the Company. Prince. Hubbard.

anxious to secure good sailors, fishermen, and mechanics, than zealous missionaries; and, while they sent out the former by hundreds, they commissioned but three or four of the latter. Still there were members of the Company who kept steadily and earnestly in view the chief end of the plantation. Differing in their religious sentiments at a time when such differences began to invade the family circle, as well as the district and parish, when even Abbot, the Primate of the Church, was infected with the growing distemper, and gave open encouragement to Puritanism, unanimity of opinion could hardly have been expected among the candidates for the post of missionaries. The question of conformity or non-conformity was therefore an indifferent one to the Company at large, provided nothing was done which could give offence to the King, and that no opportunities were afforded for "moving needless questions."\* In accordance with these views, their ministers, Bright, Higginson, Skelton, and Smith, represented all religious classes then of weight or importance in the kingdom; but, while Bright was a conformist and was accepted without hesitation, Smith, who was a separatist, was obliged to enter into bonds not to disturb the colony or injure the Company by "his rigid principles."† In conformity with this politic course, the agreements entered into between the Company and the missionaries, bound the latter to no forms of worship or principles of faith. They were required to minister to the savages, and to give religious instruction to the servants of the Company; provided this was done, their employers would be content. And, as if to put this question beyond all cavil, the Company, in their letter to Endecott, declare, "as for the manner of exercising their duties, we leave that to themselves."

The emigrants who accompanied the missionaries were as opposite in their views. Some were conformists, others non-conformists, others separatists, and others of no religion at all. Their motives for emigration were as different as their opinions were heterogenous. Of the first class were John and Samuel Browne, who were sent over by the Company to aid in administering the oath of office to Endecott, and to assist in his council. Being gentlemen of fortune, and patentees, they were specially recommended to Endecott, by the Company, as persons entitled to "his favor and furtherance."‡

---

\* Letter to Endecott.

† Hubbard. Hutchinson, &c.

‡ Letter of Instructions, May, 1628. Hazard.



But Endecott, in the discharge of his arduous duties, "had corresponded with the Brownists at Plymouth, who satisfied him that they were right." The scurvy had broken out in his little colony; and they supplied him with a doctor, who was not merely skilled in medicine, but was also a zealous controversialist. In three months he not only drove the scurvy from Naumkeag, but with it banished every vestige of the Church.\* Endecott, perhaps out of gratitude, fell a ready victim to the wiles of this cunning leech. He repudiated, without difficulty, every rule of the Church in the formation of his religious society, and modeling himself upon his neighbors at Plymouth, put it to vote whether the missionaries sent over by the Company should be the spiritual instructors of the Company's servants.† Although in his last letters from the Company he had been particularly reminded "that the propagating the gospel was the chief thing they professed above all," yet he and the missionaries, with the exception of Bright, who soon withdrew from so unpromising a field, entirely neglected their duties. The religious affairs of the colony fell into the hands of a small faction of thirty, who signed a confession of faith drawn up by Higginson, in which, though they "covenanted" to be faithful towards their children and servants, they made only one cold allusion to the Indians.‡ Thus early was the charter of the Company robbed of its sacred character.

The Brownes, astonished at these sudden developments, and unable to check them, met every Sunday, with their friends, to listen to the beautiful language of the English Liturgy. But with the intolerance and tyranny characteristic of the sect which he had lately joined, Endecott cited the brothers to appear before him to answer to a charge of sedition. The defendants might well have declined to notice a summons at once insulting and illegal; but waiving all considerations of this nature, they appeared before the governor and avowed it as their belief that the course he was pursuing had a tendency towards the lowest forms of sectarianism. For themselves, they declared their determination to adhere to the Church of England. This prediction, which was afterwards remarkably fulfilled, had no weight with Endecott, who, finding that their resolution was unalterable, and making use of the power that was confided to him for far different purposes, forcibly seized upon their persons, and, notwithstanding the prejudice to their property, sent them compulsively to England.§ An

\* Prince. † Hutchinson. ‡ Neal. Mather. § Mather. Hutchinson. Neal.

outrage so gross and palpable, could not pass without notice, although the victims found, on their arrival in London, that the Company had changed its character. They immediately petitioned for redress, and umpires were chosen, to whom the whole affair was referred, (Sept. 1629.) But nothing further appears to have been done. The charter, as originally bestowed by the King, had passed into new hands, and great lukewarmness was manifested towards redressing wrongs with which its present proprietors could have but little sympathy. Indeed, their treatment of these unfortunate gentlemen was, in the sequel, both wicked and contemptible. Fearing lest they should appeal to the King, they obtained possession of their private letters, and after violating the sacredness of their seals, voted to keep them to be made use of against the writers, as occasion should offer.\* With this hold upon their actions, they openly treated their complaints as "slanders."† But it seems that they were sensible of the imprudence of Endecott's conduct, although their ears were closed to the voice of justice. In their letters to the plantation, they rebuked the overseer and the ministers for "undigested counsels too suddenly put in execution." For, said they, such proceedings may have "an ill-construction with the State, to which we must and will have an obsequious eye."‡

In the meantime, by a striking coincidence, Endecott's conversion to Brownism had been followed by the perversion of the charter. It was at a meeting of the stockholders, at Mr. Goffe's house, in London, (July, 1629,) that that extraordinary proposition was made, which entirely altered the complexion of their affairs. Several puritan gentlemen, of birth and fortune, alarmed at the suspension of Abbot, and at the measures which were adopted to suppress that disloyalty to the Church which he had been the chief instrument in fostering, determined to transport themselves and their families to the New World. Virginia was closed to the enemies of the Church, and they therefore decided to make application to the Massachusetts Company. But aware that such a movement, undertaken for such an end, would endanger the safety of the charter, they determined to make the removal of the corporation an indispensable condition of their own emigration. With the charter in their hands, three thousand miles away from the Star-Chamber and the King's Bench, they would feel com-

---

\* Early Records of the Company.

† Letter to Skelton and Higginson, in Hazard.

‡ Early Records of the Company.

paratively safe. On sounding Cradock, the governor of the Company, they were pleased to find that he was not averse to the scheme, though from a different motive. Such had been the complaints of Endecott concerning the violations of the Company's monopoly, that it appeared for the best interests of the stockholders, that the corporation should transfer all its power to the plantation, since its presence on the spot would do more to prevent trespasses, than royal proclamations or empty threats. Cradock therefore assumed the difficult task of rendering this proposal palatable to his fellow corporators.\*

Assembled at the house of the Deputy Governor for the transaction of their ordinary business, the General Court were astonished to hear from Mr. Cradock a proposal that the charter and the corporation should be removed into another hemisphere. His proposition was couched in artful terms. To the speculators, he urged this scheme with all the force of one who cared more for his speculations than for the law; and addressing himself to those members of the Company who were touched with the disease of Puritanism, he represented how, "for certain weighty reasons," such a movement would redound to the interests of true religion. An idea so novel, for which there existed no known precedent, excited much debate. The chief opposition to the measure came from those who were largely interested in the pecuniary success of the Company, but who had no desire to leave the comforts of civilization, for doubtful prospects in the wilderness. Is such a transfer legal? If so, how are the interests of those who do not choose to leave their native country, to be adjusted? But small returns have been received for the great outlays that have been made; is the Company, after all this expense, to surrender its mercantile character, in order to become an engine of sectarianism? These embarrassing questions could not be disposed of in one session. A committee was therefore chosen to advise with counsel, and to report at the next meeting of the Court; and in the meantime, members were desired to consider secretly of the proposal, and "to take care that the same be not divulged."†

Fortunately for the success of the scheme, the counsel consulted by the committee was Mr. White, a puritan law-

---

\* Chalmer's Annals. Early records of the Company. Hubbard. Prince, &c. This is the most obscure point of this intrigue, and the only point about which there is any uncertainty.

† Early Records, &c. Hubbard. Hutchinson. Prince.

yer, who was a member of the Company, and favorable to the wishes of the applicants.\* "Great stress was laid upon his opinion;" and fortified as it was with the influence of Winthrop, Johnson, Dudley, and other distinguished persons, whose names were now for the first time divulged, it broke down the weight of opposition.† In the month of August, "after a warm debate," the question was put, whether the corporation should be removed to Massachusetts, or in other words, whether the charter of the Company should become the constitution of a State, and was decided in the affirmative by "a general rising of hands." Thus the charter passed into the hands of the Puritans. But the decision was not unanimous. Some regret perhaps might have been entertained, that a franchise, royally bestowed for a godlike purpose, should so speedily be perverted. Perhaps in some solitary breast a pang of sorrow was felt, that not one of those pagans, whose lands they were appropriating, whose game they were wasting, and whose simple fisheries they were destroying, had been taught to chant a Christian paean.

Such generous emotions, however, if they existed at all, were soon drowned in apprehensions of pecuniary loss. The minority, doubtful of the operation of the transfer, or still fearful concerning its legality, proposed that the government of the Company should wear a double aspect; and that while "the government of persons" should be established in Massachusetts, "the government of trade and merchandises" should be continued in England. Great resistance was made to this project, and the division was carried to such a length, that it was found necessary to obtain the intervention of counsel, committees, and umpires. Even Cradock himself appears to have favored this amendment to his proposition, for he was chosen one of the committee on behalf of "the adventurers," to treat with the committee on behalf of "the planters," for thus the two parties were designated. Finally, after a long and heated negotiation, it was agreed that those members of the Company who remained in England should retain a share in the stock and profits, for the term of seven years, and that at the end of that period the capital of the Company, with such accumulations as had accrued, should be

---

\* Grahame says that *eminent* lawyers were consulted, and afterwards wonders that such ignorance of the principles of law should have been displayed. The truth is, that the parties interested made all this show about counsel, in order to dissipate the scruples of the timid.

† Early Records, &c. Hutchinson.

divided among all the stockholders, in proportion to their respective interests.\*

Such was the inglorious end of a noble franchise. The salvation of the red-men was made to yield to the interests of Puritanism. The new corporators, who effected this fraud upon the King and the Church, had weightier objects in view than the propagation of the gospel. Their aspirations soared above the humble horizon of the charter, and they would not discern the melancholy truth, that thus to alter its original purpose, operated in fact to rob the Indians. Nothing obscured their mental vision but ceremonies and bishops. The hope that brightened the future with them, had for its basis the abolition of surplices. If they could stand in prayer instead of kneeling, if they could do away with the sign of the cross, if they could elevate the pulpit above the altar, if they could degrade saints' days and revive the Jewish sabbath, if they could clothe the ministry in black instead of white robes, what mattered it to them how many victims they crushed under the wheels of their Puritan Juggernaut?

Prejudice and ignorance, ever inseparable, have done much to obscure the true character of the charter; and it is a common error to believe that the franchise bestowed by Charles the First upon the Massachusetts Bay Company, was intended as an immunity to the Puritans;—that from the beginning the corporation enjoyed the same uninterrupted character. To combat this general idea is an easy, but may prove an invidious task. It can never be grateful to men to learn, that those whom they have been accustomed to reverence for a particular action, are the rather open to censure. And certainly, unless it can be shown that the charter was perverted to purposes far different from those intended by the King, the subsequent treatment of the Company by the crown, was censurable and undeserved. To vindicate the honor of Charles on this point, a brief inquiry will suffice; and it will be admitted that the law and facts agreeing, together furnish a conclusive theory.

The title of Europeans to the New World rested upon discovery. This is a principle which all civilized nations acknowledge. It derives its force from divine laws, for civilization must necessarily have preëminence over Nature, whenever the two come in contact. It reaches not to the pillage of the natives, but gives only such territorial rights as are not inconsistent with justice and equity. If the claims of prop-

---

\* Early Records, &c. White's Brief Relation. Prince. Hutchinson.

erty are recognized by the aborigines, it would be gross injustice to interfere therewith. If their laws and customs are in the main fair and equitable, there can be no justifiable plea for intrusion. How far interference may be defensible, depends upon the circumstances of each case. Vattel justly complains of the Spaniards that they tried the Inca of Peru by the laws of Spain;\* but had the Peruvians been a people living without law or order, the Spaniards would have been open to censure, if they had neglected to substitute order for chaos. Such is the fostering care that Nature claims from Art.

The title of the aborigines to the soil in America has been questioned. Whether, according to the definition of property given by Locke, such an occupancy of land was maintained by them as barred the claims of Europeans, it is not worth while to inquire. But waiving this view of the question, so harsh and inequitable as regards the rights of savages, the better opinion seems to be, that the relation existing between the aborigines and Europeans, gave "to the government of the latter, by whose subjects or authority the discovery was made, the title to the country and the sole right of acquiring the soil from the natives." Consequently, "the nations which established colonies in America, assumed the ultimate dominion to be in themselves, and claimed the exclusive right to grant a title to the soil, subject only to the right of occupancy in the Indians."† This qualified dominion therefore over the territory of New England, vested by right of discovery in the English crown, in trust for the English people; and the laws of the kingdom, so far as they were applicable to the condition of the country, became immediately in force.‡ Every Englishman who fixed his residence there, continued to be an English subject, owing allegiance to his sovereign, and bound by the laws of the realm. And the obligation was reciprocal. The oath of coronation bound the sovereign equally in every part of his dominions. He could not grant rights in America forbidden by the laws he was sworn to execute, nor could he establish political and religious systems inconsistent with those erected by Parliament. The oath so forcibly expressed in the ancient formula, "*qui il gardera et maintenera lez droitez et lez franchises de seynt esglise*," would never permit such an use of his prerogative as might

\* Le Droit des Gens, B. II, ch. 4, § 55.

† 3 Kent's Com. Vol. III, p. 379.

‡ Salk. 411, 666, 2, P. Wms. 75. Blackstone's Com. Vol. I, p. 107. 16 Pick. Rep., p. 115.

endanger her best interests. Holding all discovered countries as trustee for the benefit of his people, he would commit a fraud upon them did he carve out valuable rights therefrom, and bestow them upon a small sect whose avowed principles were hostile to the laws of the land. His custody of national property extended not to absolute ownership. He could only grant those rights and privileges which flowed from him as the fountain of honor and justice. And if his object had been to set up in his dominions a franchise unknown to the law, he must have had recourse to Parliament. For in Parliament alone rested supreme power.\*

Those writers therefore who argue that the charter was expressly intended as an immunity to the Puritans, are supported neither by law nor fact. They can show no power in the King to offer such a premium to dissent, nor were the subsequent acts of the grantees consistent with such a theory. They did not emigrate with their wives and children, nor did they publish to the world a declaration which would have been read with wonder and perhaps with admiration. On the contrary, all their religious enthusiasm was solely directed into the channel of propagation; and when the overtures of the Puritans were made for the purchase of the charter, they met them with caution and secrecy.

The argument is made complete and triumphant by an examination of the charter itself; and in a question so important, on the correct decision of which depends our capacity to judge of future events, a brief inquiry into the nature of this famous franchise will be pardoned. Was the charter of Massachusetts Bay the organization of a mercantile Company, or the constitution of a Puritan State? There are five characteristics which distinguish corporations from all other legal bodies. First, they are perpetuities, have perpetual succession, and of course power, express or implied, of electing new members. Secondly, they may sue and be sued, grant and receive by their corporate names, and, in general, do all such acts as may be done by natural persons. Thirdly, they may purchase and hold lands for the benefit of themselves and their successors. Fourthly, they must have a corporate seal. Fifthly, they may make by-laws, or private statutes, for the management of their affairs, provided they are not contrary to the laws of the land, for then they are void. These are the distinguishing features of corporations, and their powers are granted "for the advancement of religion, of learning, and of commerce."†

\* 1 Kyd 61; Cro. Car. 78, 87.  
VOL. II.—NO. IV.

† Blackstone's Com. I, p. 467.



Their property is subject to taxation, unless specially exempted, and their members are not discharged from their allegiance or loyalty. Their charters give them, on certain conditions, anomalous powers and rights; but they do not remove one duty that they owe in their corporate or individual capacities to their fellow subjects, to the King, or to God.

The application of these principles to the charter of the Massachusetts Bay Company will afford a sure key to its character. We find in that instrument no grants of powers sufficient for the establishment of a State; no authority to levy taxes, without which a government would be lifeless; no authority to assemble the representatives of the people, without which it would be impotent; no authority to erect courts of judicature, without which it would be lawless. In short, neither in the executive, legislative or judicial branch of government, is one power granted, one right yielded, or one office created, sufficient for political purposes. But in its true design, as an act of incorporation simply, the charter is admirable and complete. It did not operate to create a provincial government, but it organized a mercantile Company, conferring upon the stockholders the right to plant a colony. It granted all the powers which were necessary for the successful pursuit of commercial business. It confirmed the sale made by the Grand Council of Plymouth, of lands, waters, ports, havens, fisheries, mines, minerals and precious stones; reserving, however, to all English subjects, the right of exercising "the trade of fishing" upon the coast, and the necessary easements connected therewith. It granted even the royal mines of gold and silver which were supposed to lay "hid in the bowels of the earth," reserving only to the crown one-fifth part of the ore which might be obtained. It gave to the Company a corporate name under which to have perpetual succession, and by which to plead, prosecute, and answer all suits, quarrels, and actions, of what kind and nature soever. It gave to the Company a common seal, "to be used in all their causes and occasions," and full authority to break and alter the same. It settled the nature of the government of the Company, providing therefor a Governor, Deputy-Governor, and a board of eighteen Assistants or Directors, any seven of whom, with the Governor or his Deputy, were to be a quorum, whose frequent meetings might tend to the better management of the Company's business. It provided for four annual assemblies of all the members or Freemen of the Company, who, so assembled with the Governor and Assistants, were to constitute "great and general Courts." It

granted to these Courts the power of admitting new members to the franchise, of commissioning such officers as should be found necessary for the management of their business, and of making such regulations for the benefit of their plantation, as should not be repugnant to the laws and statutes of England. Lastly, it provided that oaths of office should be taken by the Governor, Deputy, and Assistants, for the due and faithful performance of their several duties.

Having thus organized the Company, the charter proceeds to mention more particularly the objects contemplated by the incorporators, and some peculiar privileges which the King "of his especial grace" bestowed upon them. It was made lawful for the Company to convey to their plantation in New England, any loyal subjects who were willing to proceed there, together with such foreigners as would live in allegiance to the English crown. They were further authorized to transport shipping, armor, ammunition, provisions, cattle, merchandise, and all other things necessary for the well-being of the plantation, the defence of its inhabitants, and their trade with the natives.\* And for "the further encouragement" of the Company, the charter remitted all taxes upon their property in New England for seven years, and also upon any merchandise exported or imported thence, to and from England, for twenty-one years, reserving only the usual five per cent. custom upon such merchandise due according to "the ancient trade of merchants."† It secured to the loyal servants of the Company who should inhabit the plantation, and to their children born there, the liberties and immunities of English subjects to as full an extent as if they were resident at home; and to the better attainment of this end, provided that the oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance should be administered by the Governor and any two of the Assistants, to all persons who should at any time proceed to the plantation. For the peaceable and religious government of the colony, in the hope that the example of its inhabitants might win the natives of the country to the knowledge and obedience of the only true God, which "*in our royal intention and the adventurer's free profession is the principal end of this plantation,*" the charter granted full authority to the Company in England to

\* These two privileges were, in general, controllable by royal proclamation, and the charter operated as a license under the great seal.

† This was an ancient revenue belonging to the King for two reasons, viz: because he allowed his subject to depart the realm, and carry his goods with him; and because the King is bound to maintain all ports and havens, and to protect the merchant from pirates.

establish a magistracy for their planters and servants, to make rules and ordinances, and to impose "fines, mulcts and imprisonments, or other lawful corrections, according to *the course of other corporations*" in the realm. Finally, for the special defence and safety" of the colony, it granted to those officers of the Company who were employed to manage their affairs in New England, full authority to resist by force of arms, all military invasions or other attempts made against the safety of the plantation and its inhabitants.

Such was the charter of the Massachusetts Bay Company. As a legal instrument its symmetry was perfect, its details minute, its scope expansive and free. Nothing appears wanting for the successful prosecution of missionary effort or mercantile adventure. But viewed as a political constitution, it becomes at once confused and objectless. The distinction between the Company and the plantation is destroyed, and the relation of each to the other must be a source of endless speculation. What are the powers of the executive? Where is the legislature, and where the judiciary? How is the government to be supported? For the property of all corporations is liable to taxation by Parliament, and by-laws levying money on the subject by a corporation, are void.\* Merge the Company in a people, and how can the latter assemble four times in each year? Erect the board of directors into a Council of State, and what limits their power, or defines their relation to the King? It will hereafter appear how awkwardly the charter fitted the purposes of government when the transfer was made;—how taxes were levied by the Assistants against the consent of the Freeman;—how the Assistants, irresponsible, usurped all the powers of government, so that their tyranny led the people to clamor for a *magna charta*;—how the corporate seal was entirely cast aside;—how the quarter-yearly meetings of the Company were disused as impassible customs, and how the General Court was consequently resolved into a representative and parliamentary body.

The legal character of corporations being ascertained, a rule of law applies which restrains any abuse of their privileges. Corporations can have no other rights than such as are "specifically granted." Being mere creatures of law, established for special purposes, their powers must be confined to the operations prescribed by their charters. And the Puritan-pilgrim had no sooner established his system in Massa-

---

\* Case of *Quo Warranto*, Treby's Arg. 29; Sawyer's Arg. 42; *Player v. Vere*, T. Ray. 328.

chusetts, than it became necessary for him to set up some defense for an act which was "in contempt of the laws of England." Thrusting aside the two oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, for the administration of which the charter expressly provided, he assumed that the true construction of that instrument gave him liberty to regulate his ecclesiastical affairs according to the dictates of his own conscience.\* Notwithstanding penal laws were in force at this very time against the insane fanaticism which threatened both Church and State, and soon accomplished their overthrow, it was insisted that the King had given a portion of his subjects liberty to set up in his dominions a religion utterly opposed to the national Church, to himself as the head of the Church, and which was soon to prove itself unfriendly to the monarchy itself. But however inconsistent such a construction of the charter was both with law and fact, it was equally opposed to common sense. For it is absurd to suppose that the King, knowing the applicants for this franchise to be Puritans, a sect proverbial for its turbulence and disloyalty, not only gave them a charter, but bestowed upon them special marks of his favor. It is insulting to common sense to assert that Charles intended to encourage a plantation by the remission of its taxes, the avowed object of which was the establishment of a religion, that since the days of Queen Mary had been striving for the overthrow of the Church he so dearly loved and venerated.

Weak and untenable indeed are all such arguments. They will not bear the most superficial examination. In fact, Grahame, the modern champion of Puritanism, has unwillingly abandoned these ancient strongholds of the New England fathers, venerable from their age and associations. He wanders into the law in search of some technicality which may aid an unsound theory, and drags up a maxim, in its legal acceptance equally the dictate of common sense and equity, which declares that in cases where the import of a contract is doubtful, it shall be construed most strongly against the party from which it proceeds.† The application of this maxim cannot help his cause. Though "drawn out of the depth of reason," it will be found that a critical inquiry into its meaning will limit its application to cases of "ambiguity of words," or where such an exposition is necessary "to give them lawful effect."‡ Is there any "ambiguity of words"

\* Cotton's Bloody Tenent. Mather. Neal, &c.

† *Verba ambigua fortius accipiuntur contra proferentem.* Bacon's *Maxims of the Law*, No. 3.

‡ Kent's *Coms.*, Vol. II, p. 556. Chitty on *Cont.*, p. 21.

in the charter of the Massachusetts Bay Company? Was the establishment of Puritanism necessary for missionary effort among the Indians, or for the successful prosecution of trade and commerce?

We might, were it necessary, pursue this discussion still farther. We might show how such a mode of construction can seldom be resorted to in contracts where the King is a party. We might ask under what denomination this anomalous corporation must be classified, and in what manner it was to be visited. Since there are only three classes of corporations aggregate known to the common law, ecclesiastical, eleemosynary and civil;—since the first of these must be composed of spiritual persons of whom a Bishop is visitor;—since the second are instituted upon principles of charity, such as hospitals and colleges;—and since the last are created for civil purposes only,—where is this monstrous phantasma of Puritanism to find either place or fellowship?

As a question of law, then, the charter can have no such construction as the Puritan-pilgrim contended for. It stands upon the same ground as do all other instruments of a similar nature. It supposes the corporators to be good and loyal subjects, whose desires are bounded by the acquisition of wealth, and by the moral improvement of the heathen, for whose benefit it was chiefly designed. It implies that "the true Christian religion of the realm shall not suffer any prejudice for want of certain expression."\* It assumes that the men who thus receive at their sovereign's hands such signal marks of favor, can have no intent to abuse his kindness. It takes for granted that those "loving subjects," which are surrendered to the management of the Company, will be confirmed in their allegiance, and not taught principles destructive of all honor and loyalty. Finally, it expects, that in the wilderness thus to be peopled with Englishmen, the true English heart will expand, and that, should clouds and darkness gather about the throne and Church, a steady and cheering light from New England will beam across the Atlantic, with healing on its wings.

It was in the face of such generous hopes, and contrary to all law and authority, that the missionary charter of Massachusetts Bay was converted into a political constitution. Had the corporation remained in England, the visitatorial power possessed by the King's Bench would have easily remedied

---

\* In the royal grant of Maine to Gorges, in 1639, these remarkable words are used, showing the real intent of the King, and his sense of the doings of the Puritans of Massachusetts.

any perversions of its franchise. But, as we have seen, the infusion of Puritanism into the Company was followed by a vote to transfer the charter. Puritan lawyers were readily found who sanctioned the legality of the proceeding, and an act which was begun in secrecy and doubt, was consummated in unhesitating violation of the law. "The whole structure of the charter presupposes the residence of the Company in England, and the transaction of all its business there," said a late distinguished jurist, and he but echoed the truths of history.\* Would it not have staggered the purpose of the Puritan-pilgrims, if they could have foreseen, that among all their descendants, no jurist, historian, or moralist, would be found to justify—we wish we could say applaud—this their greatest exploit?

The caution which marked every step in this transaction, saved the aspiring emigrants from interference. They refused while in England to separate from the National Church; and when they left its shores forever, they bequeathed to "their dear Mother" an address so pathetic and humble, so modest and gentle, that it is difficult to believe they were the same unhappy children who afterwards "loathed the milk they had sucked from her breasts." We have not space here to consider whether this famous address to the "Reverend Fathers" of the Church was a purely hypocritical offering dictated by policy, or a sincere tribute to the Catholic Faith, forcibly extorted from them by the influence of the home and country they were abandoning. We must hurry on to the events which followed the transfer of the charter, and ascertain whether Charles, whose bounty had been so singularly perverted, suffered the Company to proceed in its own way in Massachusetts, and beheld unmoved the establishment of a Puritan State on the ruins of a noble Church mission. Eighteen months passed away from the departure of Winthrop's fleet, before his attention was specially called to New England. During this period he was too much engaged with abuses of greater moment, which were slowly creeping around the footstool of the throne itself, to give heed to the transatlantic doings of a small company of malcontents, who departed with all the stealth of guilt from the kingdom, bearing with them a franchise which belonged to the Church. But this negligence, if it were so, was soon rebuked. Three victims of

---

\* Story's Comment. on Const. of U. S., Vol. I, § 67. See Kent's Com. II, p. 86, n. Bancroft thinks that Henry Vane, who ousted Winthrop from the office of Governor of Massachusetts, was of the same opinion. Vol. I, pp. 353, 384.

New England tyranny, Sir Christopher Gardiner, Thomas Morton, and Philip Ratcliff, all bearing marks of personal outrage and indignity, suddenly presented themselves before him as supplicants. Without manifesting any signs of guilt, or fear of the consequences, they boldly charged the Puritan State with want of allegiance to the King, and with violating the rights of the subject. Their stories are briefly told. Gardiner had been a great traveler, and claimed to be a Knight of the Holy Sepulchre. His adventures seem to have unfitted him for the quiet pleasures of domestic life, and the wilderness had more charms for him than the city. But though he had wandered as far as the remote corners of the Turkish empire, probably the most unpleasant event of his life occurred not many miles from Boston. In 1630 he was sent to New England by Sir Ferdinando Gorges, to protect the interests of his patron from any intrusion by the Massachusetts Bay Company; but, making use of the questionable finesse often employed in more important diplomacy, he gave out that he forsook the world in order to lead a godly life. Unhappily for his safety, he claimed descent from that Bishop of Winchester, who "was so great a persecutor of good Protestants;" and perhaps more unhappily for his reputation, his household was graced by "a comely young woman," whom he called his cousin, but who was suspected to be, "after the Italian manner," his concubine.

Whether this suspicion was real or pretended, it is difficult to say. It was enough that he was considered a disguised papist to make him an object of dislike, and all his advances towards friendly intercourse were consequently repelled. He manifested no unwillingness "to take any pains for his living," and offered, on many occasions, to become "a member of the Church."\* But his sincerity was distrusted, and his offers were declined. Finally, the suspicion in which he was held increased to such an extent, that his safety was endangered, and he fled from Massachusetts and placed himself under the protection of a party of Indians near Plymouth. The fellowship which was denied him by his countrymen, he found among the savages, who steadfastly resisted all attempts of the Puritan government to secure his person. But the assistance of Plymouth having been obtained, an older experience in the savage heart enabled the Governor of that colony to suggest an expedient which proved successful. Temptation, to the man of untutored passions, is almost identical with ruin. A

---

\* Hubbard. Winthrop's Journal.



reward was offered for the capture of Gardiner, and the Indians yielded to bribery what they had denied to menace. Shall we kill our guest? asked the corrupted savages. By no means, said the Plymouth Governor; bring him to us alive, if you would secure your reward. But, returned they, *the Massachusetts Indians say that we may kill him*. No, was the reply of the humane Bradford, watch your opportunity and take him alive. When the astonished Knight saw that his late friends had become transformed into unrelenting enemies, he endeavored to escape. But accidentally losing his canoe, his musket, and his sword, he had nothing to keep them at bay but a small dagger, which they soon beat out of his hands, so that "he was glad to yield." The treatment he had received was so rough, that "his hands and arms were swelled very sore." He was carried an unresisting captive to Plymouth, and soon found his way to a prison in Boston. His papers were confiscated and his private letters opened; and it did not cause an amelioration in his usage, that "a little private note book," which by some accident slipped out of his pocket, contained the day on which he was reconciled to the Pope, and the University in which he "took his scapula and degree." It was soon ascertained in what relation he stood towards Gorges, which afforded an excuse for sending him a prisoner to England.

But the afflictions of Gardiner were mild compared with those suffered by Thomas Morton. This man, an attorney of Clifford's Inn, arrived in New England in 1622, and was subsequently concerned in the company that endeavored to establish a trading post at Mount Wollaston in 1625, so named in honor of Captain Wollaston, who was at the head of the enterprise. Finding that the project was unsuccessful, this gallant Captain began to draft off his servants to Virginia, where, to use his own words, he "could turn them to better account," by selling them as slaves.\* Against such sordid villainy, Morton, a partner in the concern, protested, and excited the men to revolt, who, having turned adrift the officer appointed to carry out the nefarious scheme of their patron, abandoned themselves, in the true revolutionary spirit, to wanton excesses. They named their fortress Merry Mount, and reveled unrestrained in the spirituous liquors which a corrupt civilization had designed for the weaker heads of the Indians. They taught the savages the use of fire arms, contrary to an

---

\* Neal. Bradford. Hubbard, &c. This species of kidnapping was not uncommon in those days. See Blackwood's Magazine, Vol. XXVI, p. 607.

obsolete proclamation of King James, in order to avoid the trouble of providing their own food; and they capped the climax of their enormities when they erected a May Pole on "Merry Mount," around which to dance and sing. All these scandals were beheld with pious horror from the neighboring Plymouth rock, and by the zealots at Naumkeag. Endecott, the director of a colony whose general morality, to say the least, was questionable, visited "this school of profaneness" in 1628, cut down the May Pole, and changed its name to Mount Dagon. But Morton, unawed by this trespass, continued an establishment which he doubtless found profitable as a trucking post. The combination of all the plantations, shortly after, to effect his ruin, was equally futile. Plymouth, which had the chief part in the alliance, existed only by sufferance, as he probably knew; and he was enough of a lawyer, also, to know, that even had he been within its imaginary jurisdiction, he was not amenable for trucking fire arms with the Indians, since the proclamations of the late King, not declarative of any law, died with him. He therefore despised its menaces, resisted the formidable Standish, *vi et armis*, and when sent a captive to England, returned again the next year, not only unpunished, but unrebuked. But the arrival of Winthrop's fleet brought a more powerful and less scrupulous enemy. Having been detected in the act of taking a canoe from a party of Indians, he was arrested by order of the Court of Assistants, "set in the bilbowes," and afterwards confined until he could be again sent a prisoner to England. In the meantime his property was confiscated to discharge his debts and the expense of his passage, and his house was burnt to the ground, "to satisfy the Indians for the wrongs he had done them."\* Such was the retribution paid by Morton for unjustly taking a canoe. Had the wrongs inflicted by the Puritan State upon the Indians, been weighed in the same balance, where could it have found gold and silver sufficient to satisfy the claims of justice!

Neither Gardiner nor Morton were in any way connected with the Company of Massachusetts Bay. They were free English subjects, amenable only to English courts of justice. The injuries, therefore, that they suffered in their persons and property, were the fruits of unlawful tyranny. But with Philip Ratcliff the case was different. He was a servant of

---

\* Prince. Winthrop's Journal. Hubbard. Morton was the author of the ludicrous story of the "New England Brethren," told in Butler's Hudibras. See 1 Sav. Winthrop, p. 34, n. 3.

Cradock, the former Governor of the Company, and was convicted of uttering "scandalous invectives" against the government, and "the Church" in Salem, (June, 1631.) Of the nature of these "invectives" we are ignorant; but as his chief offense consisted, according to Morton, his fellow sufferer, in demanding payment of his wages while sick, we may suppose that in the suffering caused by disappointment, he inveighed against a Company which had undertaken to build without first counting the cost. Perhaps he was a humble follower in the path already trodden by the Brownes. But, however this may be, the punishment inflicted upon him by the Court of Assistants, was utterly disproportioned to his offense, and probably made him insane, since he was afterwards called a "lunatic."\* To impose upon a poor man already in want, a fine of £40, to whip him, to cut off his ears, and then to banish him from the limits of civilization into a wilderness, all these were surely exhibiting the worst phase of a Star-Chamber Court; since they were the exercise of the grossest tyranny, without even the color of justice.

Such were the men whom a short voyage changed from malefactors into the victims of malefaction. Much indignation was expressed at the outrages which they had suffered; and as they mingled their complaints against the Company, with charges of "separation from the Church and laws of England," an order in Council issued (Jan. 1632) directing an investigation. But the complainants were not sustained. The principal stockholders of the original Company, who still resided in England, having been summoned before a Committee of the Council, it was argued by them that the charges preferred against the corporation could only be proved by witnesses from the plantation; that they were on the point of despatching provisions and merchandise thither, and should suffer great loss if these voyages were delayed to wait the issue of a prolonged investigation; and that the faults of the directors, "if there were any," ought not to be charged upon the members of the Company, but should be reserved for future inquiry. This defense, artful, because it insinuated the residence of the Company in England, dishonest, because the voyages they were planning to Massachusetts had partly for their object the transportation of "three famous non-conformist ministers," John Cotton, Thomas Hooker, and Samuel Stone, blinded the eyes of the committee. A favorable report was made, and the Lords in Council thereupon declared that the Company

---

\* Letter of Edward Howes to J. Winthrop, Jr. 1 Sav. Winthrop, p 56, n.

should not be held responsible for the acts of "*particular men*," which "in due time were to be further inquired into." And the defendants were assured that they "might go cheerfully on with their present undertakings, and if things were carried *as was pretended when the patents were granted*, his Majesty would maintain the liberties and privileges of the Company."\*

But suspicions were now awakened that could not be wholly allayed. The attention of the King, which had been hitherto absorbed by affairs of a nearer interest, was now divided by the sorcery that was peopling New England. Complaints poured upon him thick and fast, and the frequent emigration of persons "known to be ill-affected" towards the civil and ecclesiastical establishments of the Kingdom, was vouched in as corroboratory evidence.† A year had scarcely elapsed from the first order in Council, when a second order issued, (Feb., 1633.) requiring the stay of all ships about to proceed to Massachusetts, the production of all their passenger lists, and directing Cradock, the first Governor of the Company, to exhibit the royal charter.‡ Hitherto the removal of the corporation had been unnoticed, and this command to produce the patent filled the agents of the Company with dismay. The discomfiture of trans-atlantic Puritanism and the ruin of the colony appeared alike inevitable. Fortunately for both, the charges made were so exaggerated by prejudice and enmity, that they could not be proved. The Company was not simply accused of resolving its charter into a constitution, but of open rebellion and want of allegiance. The accusation was not that the franchise had been perverted from its true missionary purpose, but that under its protection an utter separation from the English Church had been violently effected. Such charges, which only served to disguise the real mischief, were easily disproved; for the Puritan State had not yet lost all sense of loyalty in the selfish gratification of independence. Her agents could point the King to the letter from the *Arabella*, wherein the departing pilgrims prayed for the prosperity of their "Dear Mother," the Church of England, and promised to "enlarge her boundaries in the Kingdom of Jesus Christ." They could easily demonstrate the absurdity of rebellion on the part of a band of emigrants, without resources, and in a wilderness surrounded by savages and wild beasts. To produce the charter was indeed impossible, since it was three thousand miles away; but even this difficulty was

\*Winthrop's Journal. Neal. Hazard, &c.

†Winthrop's Journal. Neal. Hubbard, &c.

‡ See 1 Hazard, p. 341.

smoothed over by a promise to transmit the order forthwith to Massachusetts. These arguments, united with a plausible suggestion, that to encourage the plantation "would be very beneficial to England," since it was a country rich in natural productions and afforded masts, cordage, and naval stores,\* gained the Puritan State another victory, and emigration thither was suffered to continue, though narrowly watched. The King even expressed anger at charges which seemed to dwindle on investigation into calumnies; and he threatened to punish those persons who thus "abused his Governor and plantation." But the calm was momentary and simply caused by revulsion of feeling. The best friends of the Puritan State felt that it was tottering upon the brink of a precipice, and they privately intimated to the ruling oligarchy that it would be unsafe to attract notice by neglecting the prayers for the King, or differing widely from the ritual of the Church of England.†

One incident grew out of these proceedings, of a peculiar nature. It is related by Puritan writers, that some members of the Council assured the defendants on their dismissal that "his majesty did not intend to impose upon them the ceremonies of the Church of England; for it was considered that it was the freedom from such things that made people come over to them."‡ On this assertion, so totally irreconcilable with the order in Council, the strongest arguments in favor of New England Puritanism have been founded. But it is obvious that the position cannot be maintained. For the singular inconsistency is charged upon the King of having ordered by charter the administration of the oath of Supremacy to the members and servants of the Company, of having afterwards arrested the emigration of persons to their plantation known to be non-conformists, and then, at the time when he was endeavoring to procure conformity from the Presbyterians of Scotland, of intimating that the encouragement of Puritanism was the very reason why he granted the franchise. The guarded manner in which this assertion reaches us, proves, that if made at all, it was an *ex parte* statement resting solely on the responsibility of certain meddlers, either friendly or unfriendly, it is difficult to conjecture which, to the real interests of the colony. The assurance was not that the King had made such a declaration, but only that such was his view of

\* Winthrop's letter to Bradford, 2 Prince, 89-91. Winthrop's Journal. Hubbard, &c.

† Kirby's letter, 1 Sav. Winthrop, p. 103, n. Also letter of Edward Howes.—*Id.*

‡ This assertion is found in Winthrop's Journal.

the matter. Who were these "some of the Council?" What authority had they to compromise Charles in so grave a matter? Were they the two Archbishops, or the Earl of Manchester, Keeper of the Privy Seal, or the Earl of Dorset, Queen's Chamberlain, or Lord Cottington, Chamberlain, or Mr. Secretary Cook, or Mr. Secretary Windebanke, or Thomas Meawtes, Clerk of the Council? These were the signatures affixed to the order in Council requiring the arrest of all suspicious vessels bound to the plantation, and the same names, with one exception, were included in the Royal Commission shortly after established by King Charles for the better regulation of the English colonies. Is it probable that these high officers of State, who were so actively engaged in promoting the honor of their Master, stooped to whisper a calumny against him? And if no calumny, why all this stealth, and why was the royal intention not made known by proclamation, that all might hear and govern themselves accordingly?

On the contrary, when it appeared that this species of emigration continued, that the charter was not produced in compliance with the order, and that complaints were not hushed by the reprimand of the King, more strenuous measures were adopted. A royal commission was issued to several Lords of the Council, (April, 1635,) among whom were the Metropolitans of England, entrusting to them the protection and government of the English colonies. This commission contained the amplest powers of supervision; and the Lords Commissioners were vested with legal authority to establish conformity in America, from the banks of the Kennebec to the shores of Long Island Sound. They could "*upon just cause*" and with the "royal assent," remove Governors, punish delinquents, and constitute tribunals, civil and ecclesiastical. But the chief power entrusted to them, related specially to Massachusetts. Whereas, recites the preamble, we, by virtue of our royal authority, granted unto divers of our subjects liberty "not only to enlarge the territories of our empire, but *more especially to propagate the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ,*" we do give unto you all letters patent and other writings whatsoever, by us or our predecessor granted, and if upon view thereof, the same shall appear unto you to have been *surreptitiously and unduly obtained*, or that any privileges or liberties therein granted are hurtful to the crown, you shall cause the same to be revoked, "*according to the laws and customs of England.*"\*

---

\* This important clause both Bancroft and Grahame omit.

Affairs now hastened rapidly to a crisis. The attention of the Lords Commissioners was directed exclusively to the transfer of the charter, and to the equivocal emigration that was rapidly peopling New England. The Wardens of the Cinque Ports were directed not to suffer any persons who were subsidy men to embark for the plantations without license, nor any persons under that degree, without proper evidence that they had taken the oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, and *were in conformity with the Church of England*. The oath of Supremacy did not necessarily imply conformity, for both Robinson and Brewster, in behalf of the Pilgrims, avowed their willingness to take it, if required.\* Thus surely and carefully did the Commissioners proceed, where so much deceit had been practiced. The Grand Council of Plymouth, from whom the Company of Massachusetts Bay derived their territory, were next called upon to declare by what authority and by whose procurement the transfer had been made. They denied all knowledge of the transaction, showing their sincerity by surrendering their own patent to the King. (April, 1635.) They alluded to "the new laws and new conceits, both in matters of religion and temporal government," established by the Puritans of Massachusetts, "whereby they did *rend in pieces the first foundation of the building*," and they prayed the King "to take the whole business into his own hands," requesting only that those persons who had grants in New England might be confirmed in their titles, and "humbly dedicating to the foundation of a Church, ten thousand acres of land."†

The crown was now placed upon its strict legal rights. The franchise had been granted to further missionary effort, and to increase the prosperity of the Kingdom. Neither of these objects had been attained. Not a solitary missionary was laboring among the Indians, and instead of that general prosperity of the Kingdom contemplated by the charter, was a growing Commonwealth devoted to its own interests, utterly foreign in character as well as position, and the endless cause of confusion and complaint. The surrender by the Grand Council of Plymouth was followed by an order to the Attorney General to bring a *quo warranto* in the King's Bench against the corporation, which was accordingly served upon those members who were resident in England. But it seems that they were wearied in defending the wrong, or had become

---

\* See their letter, 1 Hazard's Hist. Coll. p. 365.

† Hazard.



disappointed in their expectations of wealth, for they appeared to the number of fourteen, among whom were Eaton, Saltonstall, Rosewell, Browne, Vassal and Foxcroft, and pleaded that they never usurped "the franchises in the information," nor did "they use or claim any of the same, but wholly disclaimed them." Judgment was accordingly given that they should be wholly excluded from the liberties usurped by the Company. Cradock, the former Governor, alone interpleaded, but he afterwards suffered default. Judgment therefore was entered up against him, that he was convicted of the usurpation charged in the information, and that the liberties and franchises of the Company should be seized into the King's hands. "The rest of the patentees stood outlawed."\*

Little further took place. The energies of the crown were required for other and more pressing duties. In 1637, initiatory measures were taken for the reconstruction of the colonies, and Sir Ferdinando Gorges was appointed by the King, General Governor of New England. But the real difficulty of the plan prevented its execution.† In the meantime Massachusetts was continually receiving an accession of numbers from England, which encouraged her to more bold opposition, when again summoned before the Sovereign she had wronged. Two hundred and ninety-eight ships were estimated to have sailed for New England from the time that the charter was granted, down to the decline of the royal cause, and of these one only is said to have miscarried.‡ On board these ships, which bridged the Atlantic, poured the turbid yet vigorous stream of Puritanism that England emptied into her colonies. In 1638 alone, three thousand persons forsook their native land for the sterile soil and ungenial climate of New England.§ Priests apostatizing the Church and flying in disguise, people abandoning the Holy Mother which had borne and blessed them, and nourished them with Her choicest food, present a spectacle sad enough; but how awful does it become when we consider that few of this recreant multitude could have left the Kingdom *without first taking the oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance and producing certificates that they were in communion with a Church which they had abandoned!*

It was not until 1638 that the Lords Commissioners, "calling to mind their former order to Mr. Cradock," and fortified by the judgment of the King's Bench, despatched fresh orders to Massachusetts, requiring the Governor, "or any others in

---

\* Hazard.

† Johnson, B. I, ch. 14.

‡ Chalmer's Annals.

§ Winthrop's Journal.

whose power or custody" was the charter, to transmit the same forthwith to England, and threatening in the event of "further neglect and contempt" to "take a strict course against them." They were the more determined in this course from the fact that the colonial government already considered it "perjury and treason" for the Freemen of the Commonwealth to speak of appeals to the King. The Freeman's oath recognized no country, no Church, no God, but those of Puritanism. The General Court no sooner received this order, than they voted an address to excuse their compliance with a demand founded "*upon pretence that judgment had been passed against their charter upon a quo warranto.*" An ingenious answer was accordingly prepared, wherein the General Court declared that if they had been notified of the *quo warranto*, no doubt they could have put in a sufficient plea to it; that if they should transmit the charter to England, "they would be looked at as runagates and outlaws," that the common people would think that his majesty had cast them off, and that they would for their safety confederate themselves *under a new government which would be of dangerous example to other plantations.* "We do not question your Lordship's proceedings," said they in conclusion; "we only desire to *open our griefs* where the remedy is to be expected. And we are bold to renew our humble supplications to your Lordships, that we may be suffered to live here in this wilderness, and that this poor plantation which hath found more favor with God than many others, may not find less favor with the King." A semi-official reply was returned by the Lords Commissioners through the medium of Mr. Cradock. They endeavored to allay the jealousies and fears which the peremptory demand of the charter had occasioned, declared their only intentions to be the regulation of all the colonies according to their commission, and promised to continue the liberties of the people of Massachusetts as English subjects. They again called upon the corporation to send home the charter, and as an earnest of their benevolent designs, authorized its present government to continue until a new patent passed the seals. The General Court voted to take no notice of this last order; for, said the members in their debates, *it is unofficial*, and the Lords Commissioners cannot "*proceed upon it*," since they can *obtain no proof that it was delivered to the Governor.* And the better to ensure this result, they directed Mr. Cradock's agent, when he again wrote to his principal, *not to mention the receipt of his last letters.\**

---

\* Winthrop's Journal. Hubbard. Hutchinson, &c.

And thus ended the controversy. Puritanism in England had passed from the ideal to the actual, and Charles was called upon to struggle for his crown over the tottering ramparts of the Church. Ought we not to have gentle thoughts of his memory, when we consider that his last wishes for New England were, that the Holy Faith which had rendered the Mother Country glorious for eight centuries, might bless the colonies that had received her name. In his controversy with the Massachusetts Bay Company, he has been represented by popular writers as harsh and tyrannical; but not only have they shut their eyes to the circumstances under which he acted, but they have also forgotten, that had he been a real tyrant, he would have avoided the forms of law, and with a single armed ship have obtained summary redress. In fact, the candid inquirer into the merits of this controversy, will admire the genius of English liberty. He will behold a great monarch defrauded by a portion of his subjects, and resorting for redress, like the humblest citizen, to the courts of law. He will carefully watch each step of this remarkable process, from the issue of the writ to the final decree, and he will look in vain for any abuse of power, or even undignified menace. Calm, quiet, patient, yet determined, is each feature in the curious exhibition. And when the proper tribunal has pronounced at last that a serious wrong has been inflicted by a party of malcontents upon their sovereign, he will find that no pomp or noise announces the royal triumph, but a simple order follows for the surrender of a perverted franchise, and a powerful corporation, the mere creature of law, becomes *ipso facto*, resolved into its primary elements.

We conclude with a single quotation. In their address to Charles II, in 1664, the General Court of Massachusetts made use of the following remarkable language: "The deepest invention of man cannot find out a more certain way of consistence, than to obtain a royal donation from a great Prince, under his great seal, which is the greatest security that may be had in human affairs." What other or happier vindication does the honor of the royal martyr need!

## THE POSITION OF CONGREGATIONALISM.

ART. V.—1. *Report of the Committee of the Central Association of Hartford County, on Dr. Bushnell's Book, entitled, "God in Christ."* Published in the Religious Herald, Hartford.

2. *Minority Report of the same Committee.* Published *ut sup.*

WE have felt small concern in reference to Dr. Bushnell's speculations as such. It was plain that they must be estimated according to their own inherent worth, and the earnestness and standing of their author. On neither ground have they seemed to us to demand any special notice at our hands. We said all that could be said of them, when we declared them to be merely a new combination of old and exploded heresies. In themselves, therefore, they had not the smallest claim to any theological consideration whatever. Neither have we ever entertained the idea that Dr. Bushnell was any further in earnest in his speculations, than simply to gain a degree of notoriety for himself, and to set up a character for originality, profundity, and acumen. His unsurpassed self-complacency, his love of paradox, his paroxysms of effort after new modes of speech, and types of thought, his offer to sign any kind of a creed that could be devised, his quixotic tilt against the established laws of language and of logic, all go to stamp him as a theological *charlatan*, who panders to a diseased love for novelty, palms off pert conceitedness for an earnest-minded love of truth, and mistakes the notoriety of an empiric for the fame of a philosopher. His position was simply that of a Congregational Pastor, who was perpetually told by a small following who "sat under his preaching," that he was "a man of power." Whether, then, we considered his speculations themselves, his apparent character and probable aims, or his position in the world, there was no reason why a Church Review should take any other than the most passing notice of these crude fancies, and newly vamped heresies.

Events, however, often give to things a degree of importance which they have not in themselves; and this has been the case with Dr. Bushnell's views. His triple-headed theological monstrosity has been made the subject of considera-

tion, by a respectable representation of Connecticut Congregationalism, who have decided, after receiving its author's explanations, that it is really no monstrosity at all! It is not, then, what Dr. Bushnell has said, but what the Congregationalism of Connecticut has, in the persons of its representatives, accepted, as involving no fundamental error, and clearing its author from the charge of heresy, that we propose to consider. For, this we regard as a grave matter, and one deserving of the most careful attention. We have little doubt, indeed, that the charge of reviving any or all of the early heresies, which disturbed the Church, would give Dr. Bushnell no other solicitude, than the fear that his reputation for *originality* might be somewhat damaged. Nor can we divest ourselves of the feeling, that many of his brethren would regard such a charge as hardly deserving one serious thought. To such we have nothing to say. But some we trust there are, who may be induced to pause and reflect, when they see fairly stated, this new proof of the downward tendencies of New Englandism. And it is to these, that, aside from the members of our own communion, we would now address ourselves.

Our first step must be to put our readers in possession of certain historical facts. It appears, then, that at some period or another, after the publication of the work entitled, "God in Christ," a committee of five persons were appointed by the "Central Association of Hartford County," to examine its statements, and report whether they found in it fundamental errors. This examination was, however, to be accompanied with personal conference with the Author of the Work, whose explanations were, in consideration it would seem of his extraordinary use of language, to be taken in connection with the Work itself. The result has reached us in three reports; one a unanimous report, and one from the majority and the minority of the Committee respectively. To the Minority report we shall have occasion to refer, but it is with the Unanimous report, and that of the Majority, that we are mostly concerned.

The Committee unanimously reported, that the work of Dr. Bushnell, taken by itself, denied (1) the real Trinity in the Divine Nature, (2) the Personality of our Lord anterior to the Incarnation, and (3) the Vicarious Sacrifice of Christ. The Majority report, accompanying this Unanimous one, denies, however, that, as explained by Dr. Bushnell, his views on these topics contain fundamental errors. And this report being accepted by the Association, binds them to the same declaration, and therefore, as we shall proceed to show, to the support of acknowledged and pestilent heresies.

From this charge, however, are to be exempted two of the Hartford Pastors, who formed the Minority of the Committee, and who, with one other person, we understand, voted against the adoption of the Majority report. We believe we have stated this point correctly, although there is a confusion which is perplexing, in all the accounts, as to the vote of the Association. At all events, with the exceptions just noted, the Association stand committed, as we have already said. The framers of the Minority report—Dr. Hawes and Mr. Clark—occupy a position to which we gladly accord honor and sympathy. While, at the same time, we feel perfectly assured, that all their exertions will not for one instant check the downward progress of Congregationalism, and that they are destined, day by day, to find themselves more and more isolated and alone.

With these remarks upon the facts in the case, we proceed to the consideration of the Majority report. And adhering to that division which the Committee have themselves laid down, we propose to see to precisely what doctrines, Connecticut Congregationalism, as represented in Hartford County, stands pledged.

I. Our first topic is, the Person and Nature of our Blessed Lord. Says the Report,—“Respecting the person of Christ, Dr. B. has been extensively supposed to deny the reality of his human nature; and he does explicitly deny the distinct *action* of his humanity, p. 155. Yet there are many passages, in the course of the discussion, in which the humanity of Christ, as well as his divinity, is acknowledged, or necessarily implied. That Dr. B. acknowledges Christ to be truly God, is not, and cannot be questioned. The title of the book, ‘God in Christ,’ and the course of argument throughout the book, imply it. He does not, indeed, acknowledge the personality of Christ as distinct from the Father, anterior to the Incarnation, neither does he mean to be understood to deny this. He considers it to be among the unsolvable mysteries of the Godhead. But that Christ is truly God, he does most explicitly acknowledge and labor to establish, p. 122. So also does he as plainly acknowledge him to be truly and properly man. He expressly speaks of him as ‘a human person,’ p. 169. He speaks of him as being a man, among ‘other men,’ and yet differing from ‘other men,’ and this not only as he is ‘better,’ but as ‘he is God,’ p. 123. He speaks of him as ‘the divine-human,’ ‘representing in his simple unity,—one person,—the qualities of his double parentage, as the Son of God and the son of Mary,’—‘the holy thing in which our God is

brought to us,—into a fellow relation to us,—our brother, not less than our Lord and Saviour,' pp. 163-4. Such things cannot be truly affirmed of one who is not properly man. Dr. B. cannot be accredited as true and sincere, if he does not believe in the proper humanity of Christ. The only thing in which he differs from the commonly received faith on this subject, as stated in his own language, is, his denying that 'the human soul or nature of Christ is to be spoken of, or looked upon, as having a *distinct* subsistence, so as to live, think, learn, worship, by itself.' He would be understood to say, if we apprehend his meaning, that when Christ is spoken of by the Evangelists, as increasing in wisdom, as hungry and thirsty, as weeping, praying, agonizing, these are not predicated of him as man distinctively; and so also when he is spoken of as hushing the tempest, as raising the dead, these are not predicated of him as God distinctively; but that whatever is said of him is predicated of him, 'in his simple unity,' as the 'divine-human,'—'God manifest in the flesh,'—'the Christ;' insisting that 'the theory of two distinct natures or agencies in Christ,' is virtually denying any real unity between the divine and the human,—substituting collocation and partnership for unity,—so that, instead of a person whose nature is the reality of the divine and the human, we have two distinct persons," p. 154.

The first thing which especially strikes us here, is the ignorance or carelessness of the language of Theology, which both Dr. Bushnell and the Committee exhibit. Thus, at one time our Lord is spoken of as "a human Person;" and then again as "simple unity, one Person." In another place, "human Nature" is used as synonymous with "human soul;" whereas it includes under it, "a reasonable soul, and human flesh." While in another still, it is argued that the theory of two Natures involves the idea of two Persons! All this plainly indicates an ignorance that is lamentable, or a carelessness that is still more so. The erroneous positions, to which we wish to call attention, are the following:

1. The refusal to acknowledge the distinct Personality of our Lord, anterior to the Incarnation, without going so far indeed, as actually to deny it. This is the qualified statement which Dr. Bushnell's explanations enable the Committee to make; and this declining distinctly to deny, is the only abatement, so far as we can see, that saves him from the charge of fundamental error. But what is it worth? How much can the non-committal system avail here? The Committee and the Association either regard the point in question



as fundamental, or they do not. If they do not, why not say so at once, and boldly sanction the positions of the Book, without all this unnecessary explanation? If they do, then what possible difference is there between refusing to confess a fundamental truth, and denying it? At this rate a man may refuse to acknowledge the being of God, and yet by saying that he will not deny it, claim rank as a believer. In such matters, he that is not with the doctrine is against it, and refusal to confess, is tantamount to denial.

And what are the grounds on which Dr. Bushnell refuses either to own or deny? Why, forsooth, that the subject is an "unsolvable mystery!" Unquestionably it is. Unquestionably, every thing pertaining to the Godhead is an "unsolvable mystery." And who ever supposed that the Catholic Creeds, or any of the Dogmatic statements of the Church, were intended to *explain* these mysteries? On the contrary, they are only designed so to set them forth, so to propose them for the belief of the faithful, as negatively to avoid errors, and positively to assert truth; which errors might, very likely, be the attempt to explain mysteries, and which truth would undoubtedly present unsolvable mysteries. If such explanations are to be received on such grounds, we cannot see why Atheism itself, provided only it will content itself with refusing to confess God, must not be accepted. The position, however, be it observed, which is thus accepted, is plain and undisguised Sabellianism.

2. The assertion that our Lord is "a human Person." It is true indeed, as we have already seen, that both Dr. Bushnell and the Association, use the word Person in a very strange and confused way. Sometimes they seem to confound it with Nature, and then to use it in its proper theological sense. The assertion however of a human Person, is Nestorianism.

3. The denial of a distinct human Soul to our Lord. This denial is accompanied, as we have shown, by a manifest confusion of the terms "soul," and "nature." The view involves both Apollinarianism, and the Monothelite heresy. Since if the human soul did not live and act by itself, there could have been in our Lord only one Will.

4. The declaration that hunger, thirst, and in general, bodily infirmities, are not predicated of our Lord, as "distinctively man." For it involves the Patripassian heresy to assert that God suffered, unless it be in respect of that human Nature, which was hypostatically united to the Divine, in the one Person of the Eternal Word. The difficulty here, would

seem in part to have arisen from an ignorance of the *communicatio idiomatum*, or communication of idiomatic properties: a mode of speech, that is, by which the attributes of the Divine and human natures, provided that abstract and not concrete terms are employed, may be indifferently predicated of the one subject, the Person of Christ.

5. The positive denial of the two distinct Natures, and the putting in their place a *tertium quid*, confused and mixed from both, and calling this confused admixture the one Person of Christ. The former part of this view is mere Eutychianism, and the latter, while it partakes of the nature of Sabellianism, is, on the whole, original.

Thus then, it appears, that in those statements concerning the Person and Nature of our Blessed Lord, which the Association have accepted as sufficient, and involving no fundamental errors, and which Dr. Bushnell no doubt considers as his own excogitated verities, there are no less than six old forms of heresy, ages ago considered, condemned, and anathematized by the Christian Church!

II. We proceed, in the second place, to the subject of the Holy Trinity. Says the Report, quoting and accepting Dr. Bushnell's explanations,—“I start with the conception of the one God, different, I suppose, in no wise from the one substance or *homoousion* of the Church; which one God is developed to us, or becomes a subject of knowledge, under the conditions of a threefold personality. I take the Three, therefore, in their Threeness, as distinct grammatical personalities, as they are practically employed in the Bible, acting and interacting mutually towards each other as the Bible represents; only refusing to investigate their interior mystery, believing that in such a use of them I receive in the truest and fullest manner the One God. The Trinity in Unity, as there set forth, I constantly preach in public, regarding it as necessary to the efficiency of the gospel in saving souls. I love this Trinity. I live upon it. Without it I feel that I could not work my mind and heart in the private exercises of my own Christian life.” It must be observed, that in this passage the assertion that the Godhead *exists* “under the conditions of a threefold personality,” seems to be even studiously avoided; and it is only said, that in this way “It is developed to us, or becomes a subject of knowledge.” Now this, taken in connection with the refusal to acknowledge the Personality of our Lord prior to His Incarnation, seems to us to make out a pretty clear case. What further explanations may be vouchsafed, we cannot say; we take the *ipsissima verba* as they

stand. They declare, that the Godhead is "one substance," which "is developed to us under the conditions of a threefold personality," and that under these same conditions it "becomes a subject of knowledge." Now this development was made, this knowledge gained, in and by the Incarnation. *Ex vi terminorum*, this conclusion is necessary. And how was it anterior to this? How was it before the time when this threefold personality was developed from, or discerned in, this one substance? Clearly it did not exist.

But this idea of one original substance, afterward distributed or developed into three Persons, is no new notion. If it is understood to imply that the one substance, according to its various operations, is successively presented to us, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, then it is mere Sabellianism. If, on the other hand, it means, that at one and the same time, or at successive periods even, this one original substance was developed into three coëxistent Persons, then it is no more than that sophistical argument which Paul of Samosata used to puzzle honest Christians with, and which was condemned by the Council of Antioch about sixty years before the Nicene Synod. We have no doubt ourselves, that this last is the view intended to be expressed in the extract. And the belief that it is so, is strengthened by the peculiar and uncatholic use of the word *ὁμοουσιόν*,—consubstantial,—which, for all we can see, is employed here in exactly the sense in which it was employed by Paul of Samosata, in his famous quibble. We will present to our readers that exposition of the matter which Bishop Bull has gathered from St. Athanasius and St. Basil.

Paul of Samosata, wishing to make capital for himself, and to advance his original views about the Trinity, "started" with the word *ὁμοουσιόν*, and built upon it a notable sophism. He argued that the word, if used at all, involved the idea of one substance, existing from eternity it might be, and afterward developed, or distributed, into the Persons of the Father and the Son. This he very justly concluded was such an absurdity, that if it could really be charged upon the word in question, it would compel Catholics to give up the word, and it might be to abandon the doctrine of the Trinity. The Council of Antioch, however, saw through the trick, condemned the doctrine of the sophism, and forbade the word to be used in any such sense.

And now, marvellous result of being wiser than all teachers, this identical use of the word *ὁμοουσιόν*, and this identical sophism of Paul of Samosata, are gravely revived, as a New

England invention, in this century of progress, and gravely accepted, as a sufficient and orthodox statement of doctrine, by a prominent body of Congregational Pastors! And thus, that view of the Holy Trinity, without which this complacent "I," cannot "work his mind and heart," turns out to be the cunning quibble of one who, for sixteen centuries, has been the scorn of Christendom!

The Catholic doctrine, professed ever by the Church of God in Heaven and on earth, professed even by the Puritan Fathers, in older and more learned days, is this: That from eternity, and irrespective of all human knowledge, and of any ways in which it has been manifested or made known to men, the Godhead has existed in one undivided Substance, and three unconfounded Persons, coëqual and coëternal; the unbegotten and unproceeding Father, the eternally begotten Son, and the eternally proceeding Spirit. In place of this great Doctrine, Dr. Bushnell has propounded, and the Association have received, the following notion: That there is one divine and eternal Substance, which, not from all eternity, but at such time as it is developed to men, presented to their intellects, and taken cognizance of by their knowledge, comes to exist, "under the conditions of a threefold Personality." And this fancy, condemned ever since the Council of Antioch,—this fancy, which does not even come up to the dignity of Sabellianism, and at which Paul of Samosata sneered, which subjects the mysteries of the Divine Nature to the conditions of human knowledge, and degrades that mighty verity on which all others hang, from an objective truth into a subjective conception,—is accepted as a sufficient statement, involving no fundamental error, and entitling him who holds it, to be regarded as an orthodox believer. There can of course be but one step more, and that will be easily taken.

III. We are thus brought to our last topic for examination; the Atonement. Says the Report, again quoting and accepting Dr. Bushnell's statements: "I hold most emphatically the doctrine of justification by faith, and that any and every form of religion which proposes to save mankind on terms of merit or desert, is not Christianity. As regards the ground of justification, I believe that without something done, which in Christ is done, to declare the righteousness of God and maintain the sanctity of law, a free pardon offered to sinners would be nearly equivalent to a dissolution of government. At the same time, I look upon Christ as fulfilling the highest and principal office of his Messiahship, by means of the Incarnation itself, that is, by the revelation he makes of God's

feelings towards us in and through the human state assumed, and the immense power he exerts, or is to exert, in this manner over our spiritual character. He is thus emphatically 'the Life,' the new-creating grace of God, the wisdom of God, and the power. To preach Him in this character is my deepest study, and my intensest love to Him centers here."

Put into plain language, to what does all this amount? simply to this: that by the death of the Redeemer, God's hatred to sin is so evidenced, that the sanctity of law is maintained, and the Divine government is not nullified by a pardon accompanied by no such manifestation; that the great work of Christ is fulfilled, by His revealing God's feelings towards us in His Incarnation, and by the power which this knowledge will be likely to exert over our characters. Now, no doubt, the life of Christ, from the cradle to the grave, is one organic whole, and it is by the merits of the entire, undivided God-man, that our souls are won again to God. But then, in unfolding this truth, Catholic Theology has several distinct propositions which she lays down, and which this statement utterly ignores. 1. That by His Incarnation, our Lord established a real and living union between our humanity and the Godhead; a union which is carried out and continued in that mystical Body, His Church, in whose communion "the Divine Nature," His perfect merits, and the benefits of His Passion, are applied to individuals. 2. That by His Passion, our Lord actually bare our sins, the sins of all mankind, in His own body on the tree, standing in our place, and offering, not indeed an absolute and unconditional, but still a perfect and sufficient sacrifice for us, and purchasing for us the pardon of God, and the gift of the Holy Ghost. 3. That by His Resurrection and Ascension to the Father's right hand, He sent down the Holy Spirit in His Church, to seal His promises, to make effectual His work of Redemption, and to communicate His presence to individual believers. The three great points, then, thus duly adjusted and connected in the Catholic Faith, are the Incarnation, the Passion, and the Resurrection with the Ascension.

Now, the statement accepted by the Association jumbles all these together, distinctly confesses none, and distinctly discredits some. Thus it makes the Incarnation, not an actual union of Godhead with humanity, but simply a revelation of God's feelings; and it decides the work of the Incarnation to be merely the moral and intellectual operation of this revelation on our minds and hearts. And here again we have a subjective conception, put in the place of an objective reality.

By this view, moreover, the Church becomes a school of thinkers, not an Organic Body of living souls.

But the point especially in question is, the Vicarious Sacrifice of Christ. And certainly we cannot see that it is in any sort of sense acknowledged by Dr. Bushnell, or required by the Committee. It must be observed, then, that in the first place, the Incarnation is distinctly placed on higher ground than the Atonement, or at least, that subjective conception of it is, which we have just exposed. It is decided, that the principal office of the Messiahship is discharged in it, and thus the opposite extreme is reached from that older method in Puritan Theology, by which the Atonement was exalted, at the expense of the Incarnation. And now, it being thus thrust down, what is the view of it, which the Hartford Association accept as sufficient? Simply this: that by it the righteousness of God is declared, and the sanctity of law maintained. And to what does this amount? How far does this go beyond mere Socinianism? We confess that we do not perceive any appreciable difference. The entire scheme of the Atonement seems, according to it, to come to this: "God being desirous to rescue man from the consequences and dominion of his sins, and yet desirous to effect this in such a way as might best conduce to the advancement of virtue," fearing to offer a free pardon to sinners, lest the divine government should be dissolved, determined to maintain the sanctity of law, and to declare His own righteousness, by the life and sacrifice of His Son. Now this amounts to nothing. It is no Atonement. It is no Vicarious Sacrifice. Its statements do not in the smallest degree answer the conditions, which the doctrine requires. It is not a whit better than the old demonstration scheme of the Socinians, the pure benevolence theory of Priestly, or the exposition of Taylor, in his *Ben Mordecai*, approved and accepted by Belsham. It has, up to this point of time, been supposed, that in holding distinctively, clearly, and without all doubt, to the doctrine of the Vicarious Sacrifice and the real Atonement, the Congregationalism of Connecticut had some grounds for its self-complacent arrogation of the appellations *orthodox* and *evangelical*. So far as the Association of Hartford County is concerned, those grounds are utterly abandoned.

And now, having seen precisely what forms of Heresy, condemned in all ages by the Christian Church, these Pastors have accepted as orthodox doctrine, let us proceed to inquire how far they have departed, from their once acknowledged standards and confessions. When the Saybrook Platform of



Discipline was adopted in Sep., 1708, there was also adopted the Savoy Confession of Faith, agreed to in Boston in 1680: and this, so far as we know, is the Standard of doctrine for Connecticut. We extract its statements concerning the Incarnation, the Trinity, and the Atonement:

1. "The Son of God, the second Person in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance and equal with the Father, did when the fulness of time was come, take upon Him man's nature, with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin, being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of her substance: so that two whole perfect and distinct natures, the Godhead, and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion; which Person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only mediator between God and man." c, viii, sec. ii.

"Christ in the work of Mediation, acteth according to both natures, by each nature doing that which is proper to itself: yet by reason of the unity of the person, that which is proper to one nature, is sometimes in Scripture attributed to the Person denominated by the other nature." c, viii, sec. vii. This appears to be an awkward way of putting the *communicatio idiomatum*.

2. "In the unity of the Godhead there be three persons of one substance, power, and eternity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost: the Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding: the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost, eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son." c, ii, sec. iii.

3. "The Lord Jesus" undertook "the office of a mediator and surety," "which that He might discharge, He was made under the law, and did perfectly fulfill it, and underwent the punishment due to us, which we should have borne and suffered, being made sin and a curse for us." c, viii, sec. iii and iv.

Such were the Doctrines which Congregationalism in Connecticut held, one hundred and forty years ago. Such is the standard from which, for nearly half a century,—for almost that period has elapsed, we believe, since Andover, by its Professor, proclaimed that the eternal generation of the Son of God was "eternal nonsense,"—Congregationalism has been declining. Until now, the representatives of those who aided in establishing that confession, the Hartford Central Association deliberately and distinctly trample it under foot, and accept in place of it, the very heresies which it was intended to deny. Now there can be only two ways of accounting for this; or perhaps both ways may have had something to do with. Either theological learning has so run down among the Pastors of Connecticut, in their strainings after originality, and their desire to be considered "among the most *powerful minds* in this or any other country," that they really know nothing of their own standards, or of the history of heresies, and so adopt old errors in the dark; or else the care, and love, and reverence for positive truth, have so gone to the wall, while they have been proclaiming that to be true which each man believes to be, that they are given over to believe lies, and to deny verities without caring whether they are verities



or not. In either point of view, or in both, it is a horrible and a hopeless condition in which they are.

And how has it come about? What are its causes? How can it be explained? There are doubtless many reasons, but we shall suggest four, which we conceive to have been especially powerful and operative.

Puritanism, in New England, started with a principle which, if carried out, could hardly lead to any other result than that which we everywhere behold. Mr. Robinson enunciated it, in his farewell discourse at Leyden, when he informed his hearers that as time went on, changes and improvements would doubtless be introduced into religion, from which he would not have them turn away. It was precisely the modern theory of progress and development, stated after the fashion of the day.

Then again, in the Confession adopted in 1708, theological opinions, and those the opinions of Calvin, were mixed up with Christian verities in such a way as seemed to indicate no distinction between them, either as to their ground of authority, or obligations of acceptance. Both were regarded as standing in the same position. Verities were lowered to the level of opinions, and confused with them as part of one system. And thus, when the opinions fell, the verities shared their fate. These verities, moreover, were always kept much out of view, and always stood to one side, in these Confessions and compilations, which were only occasionally used at any time, and the use of which naturally became more and more infrequent. They never seemed to form a part of the continuous religious life. There was no Service, no Liturgy, in which they were continually presented to, and used by, the people. They were always a sort of unconnected excrescences on the religious character, and thus they easily came to be regarded as dried specimens in Theology, and doctrinal curiosities.

But more than all, the Doctrine of the Trinity, which contains within itself all possible Christian verities, was committed by our Lord, in the Formula of Baptism, to His Apostles and their successors till the end of time. The Succession and the Doctrine thus became correlatives. When the Succession was retained the Doctrine could not be permanently lost; although for a time it might be said that it was *Athanasius contra mundum*. Where the Succession was given up, there, sooner or later, the Doctrine would be lost. Witness to this, as matter of history, are abundant,—Germany, Geneva, France, Scotland, and New England. We wish that

the honest and earnest minded among Congregationalists would examine Church History, with a view to this matter.

Such, then, if we may take the Hartford Central Association as an index, and we can see no reason why we may not, such is the condition of the Congregationalism of Connecticut. Such are some of the main causes which have brought her to her low and fallen state. Committed to manifold heresies; speaking with discordant voices; unable to distinguish the verities of the Faith from the opinions of men; subjecting all verities to the conditions of human knowledge; abandoning her own original ground; training up a generation of infidels; making common cause with Antichrist by denying the Son, and therefore denying the Father also; the hand-writing of God's finger seems to be upon her, and she has but one more step to make, to reach an utter apostasy! God grant that many of her children may flee from her falling ruins, to safer homes and more secure abiding places!

We will conclude our remarks with a supposed case. Let us suppose, then, that the Committee had decided that there were fundamental errors, that is to say, heresies, in Dr. Bushnell's treatises. It would, under such circumstances, have become necessary to proceed to some judicial acts; to trial, and to discipline. And here we cannot but see, that Congregationalism would have been placed in an awkward predicament, to save it from which, its friends have plunged it into one more awkward still. The alternatives were severe which were presented. On either side there were difficulties, perplexities, and dangers. To give up the charge of error, and to declare that there was no ground for judicial proceedings, was to surrender many of the essential verities of the Faith, and to make common cause with the most fearful heresies. To attempt to judge and to punish, would be only to demonstrate, before all men, the powerlessness and impotence of Independency. For what must have been the inevitable result of a process for heresy?

In the first place, by what standard could the accused have been tried? By the Doctrinal Decisions of the Church, and the two Catholic Creeds? No. For although Puritanism once accepted the decisions of the first four Councils, the idea of resorting to them would now be scorned and scoffed at. By the Savoy Confession? No. For there is not one Pastor in a hundred who believes it. By the Creed of the Association? No. For there is no such thing; since every Pastor, with the aid of his Church members, like the Pope in Council, alters the Catholic Faith to suit himself. We see no pos-

sible standard that could have been resorted to, unless the Association had set themselves to compose one, out of their own theological stores. Now to say nothing of the abominably tyranny of subjecting a man to such a standard, far worse than any tyranny of Papal Rome, we may well wonder what sort of a Confession would have resulted from the combined excogitations of the various Pastors composing the Association. The absurdity of the position in which Congregationalism would thus have found itself, is too evident to require illustration.

And even if some sort of standard had at last been agreed upon, and the independent mind, which all Congregationalism would laud for refusing to submit to the decision of continuous and universal Christendom, had consented to be tried by the whims and caprices of a handful of living men, what possible discipline, that would amount to any thing, could have been inflicted? Dr. Bushnell and his Church-members would still have continued a Church, *totus teres atque rotundus*, as complete and entire, according to the Congregational theory, as any since the Ascension. His office and mission, coming from his people, could not be taken from him by his brethren; and the simple refusal to exchange pulpits, would have summed the discipline of the heretic. What would he have cared for this, so long as its only effect on him was an increase of notoriety? What would his congregation have cared, so long as its only effect on them, was to ensure the uninterrupted hearing of their Pastor's speculations, without the necessity of occasionally sitting through a more orthodox and more stupid sermon? Both would have laughed to scorn a discipline which ended in such an utter farce; and the nakedness of the land would have been exposed for nothing.

Miserable, therefore, as the alternative has been, we can, under the circumstances, hardly wonder that the Association, without probably knowing what they have done, have chosen to incur the condemnation of ages, rather than the laughter of a generation. It is, on all hands, and in every point of view, the most complete demonstration of the original powerlessness, and the wretched decline of the Polity and Doctrines of Congregationalism, that can well be imagined. And we end with the wish, sincere and devout, which we have already expressed, that earnest and honest minds will pause ere they make the final plunge, on the verge of which New Englandism is now trembling, and draw back before they are dashed into the abyss of Apostasy from the Gospel of the Saviour.

## ABSOLUTION AND CONFESSION.

- ART. VI.—1. *The Calendar Newspaper*, from March 24, to December 29, 1849. Hartford: Samuel Hanmer, Jr.
2. *The Priestly Office, a Pastoral Letter to the Clergy of North Carolina*; by their Diocesan, the Right Rev. L. SILLIMAN IVES, D. D. New York: Stanford & Swords. 12mo. pp. 27.
3. *Voice of the Anglican Church on Confession*. New York: Stanford & Swords. 12mo. pp. 16.
4. *Confession as held by the Anglican Church, designed chiefly as an antidote to a pamphlet entitled "Voice of the Anglican Church," originally published in "The Churchman," April 21*. By a Presbyter of the Diocese of New York. New York: E. P. Allen. 12mo. pp. 35.
5. *A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy and Laity of his Diocese*. By the Rt. Rev. L. SILLIMAN IVES, D. D., Bishop of North Carolina. 12mo. pp. 79.
6. *The Doctrine of Repentance, being a Review of "a Pastoral Letter to the Clergy and Laity of his Diocese," &c.* By the Rev. J. H. HANSON, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Waddington, N. Y. 12mo. pp. 88.
7. *An Examination of the Doctrine declared, and the Powers claimed, by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Ives, in a Pastoral Letter, &c. &c.* By a Lay Member of the Prot. Ep. Church in North Carolina. Philadelphia: H. Hooker. 12mo. pp. 105.
8. *The Sacrament of Repentance, a Plain Tract. By a Minister of the Protestant Church, but a believer of the Catholic Faith*. New York: Appleton. pp. 23.
9. *A Voice from Connecticut, occasioned by the late Pastoral Letter of the Bishop of North Carolina to the Clergy and Laity of his Diocese*. By the Rev. SAMUEL FARMAR JARVIS, D. D., LL. D. With the approbation of the Bishop of Connecticut. Hartford: Calendar press. 12mo. pp. 50.

It is now matter of History, that the year 1849 was signalized by a movement in our Church, towards the restoration of Sacramental Penance. While we were devoutly commemorating the completion of the three hundredth year of our reformed ritual and worship, the discord of an extraordinary reaction was becoming painfully audible; and the

year has closed with a tumult of agitation and remonstrance, in the course of which certain parties have completed their treachery, by open apostasy to the Tridentine communion. During the whole of this period of excitement and humiliation, it has been apparent that the Church is generally free from any sympathy with the retrograde principles of the agitators, while "the voice from Connecticut" has been uniform and decided, from the earliest articles of the Calendar, to the conclusive testimony of the venerable presbyter whom the whole American Church delights to honor. May the diocese of Seabury never want sons to maintain its primeval principles against the spirit of innovation, from whatever quarter, or in whatever shape, it may threaten their subversion.

The origin of this movement, and in a great measure its progress, is yet unexplained and mysterious; and it is not our province to trace the history of the matter, or to suggest its probable explanation, any further than facts, now publicly made known, and recorded in documents, render it necessary that we should recognize them. As early as February 26th, 1848, it was more than intimated, in the columns of the Calendar, by a writer who evidently weighed his words and wrote with counsel, that a Religious Order had been founded in our Church, of which a Bishop was the Superior, and of which the results would be dangerous. So cautious and delicate, however, were the allusions of this article, that they were by no means apprehended as pointing to real dangers, and for a time there was caution on the part of the Order itself, and quiet in the unsuspecting Church. The progress of events was nevertheless carefully watched, and on the 24th of March, 1849, the attack was renewed, in the Calendar, with less reserve, and directed towards a more combustible portion of the enemy's works. An explosion was the immediate result, of which the particulars are still so fresh in the minds of our readers, that we may spare ourselves the pains of enumerating them, especially as our present remarks are merely preliminary to our direct purpose. On the 5th of May, the article on Religious Orders was republished in the Calendar, from its pages of the year preceding, with a plain avowal of its meaning, and with the positive assertion of the existence of such an Order in the Church, conflicting with the canonical obedience of several of its members, and evidently attempting to Romanize its literature and theology. These facts are important, in connection with the subject to which we now apply ourselves.

Early in the past year appeared the Pastoral Letter of Bishop Ives, on the *Priestly Office*. Its very earnest tone, and

somewhat equivocal phraseology, seemed to indicate a deep meaning, and a serious purpose, which were delicately approached, rather than fully declared. Our former affection and regard for the amiable prelate who had put them forth, could not relieve us from the feeling that *more was meant than met the eye*, for, as we read, we found ourselves, as it were, pushed to conclusions, which, like the *Ergo* after the major and minor premises of a syllogism, required nothing further, in express words, to complete the argument. For example, the right reverend author deprecates "a vague and general repentance, a repentance not accepted by the representatives of Christ, who alone have charge of the discipline of His Church, or the power to remit and retain sins;" and in this single sentence, taken in its connection with the context, we seem to arrive at the principles of (1) the *necessity* of a special and particular *confession* to a priest, and (2) of the *judicial* nature of sacerdotal "acceptance," or *absolution*. The language, however, is cautious, and might not seem to others so conclusive; but to all, we think, the sentence we quote must be indicative of the author's distrust of the General Confession, and Absolution of our Communion Office, as sufficient to the spiritual necessities of the penitent, in all ordinary circumstances. At all events, we must observe that in close connection with this official document, appeared soon after, and was circulated by the same parties, the tract entitled, *Voice of the Anglican Church on Confession*, in which, by way of a catena, the teaching of Anglican Doctors and Standard Books was professedly set forth. In reply to this pamphlet, appeared soon after another, from a press in New York, in which, upon a similar plan, the teaching of certain American Standards and Doctors, was arrayed against those of our Mother Church.

We fully recognize our duty, as to *practice*, to be governed strictly by our own canons and rubrics; but to assert that religious principle, and not local circumstances, makes the ground of our differing practices, is to assert that we are dissenters from the principles of the Church of England. This doctrine has received a very general rebuke, and the pamphlet has done nothing in the controversy, further than to illustrate its own impotence and corruption. As Churchmen of Connecticut, we must be pardoned for saying, further, that if ever its principles should be recognized by authority of this Church, in her General Councils, a most solemn compact will be broken, not only with the Church of England, but also with this Diocese, which never could become a party to any thing

destructive of unity in doctrine and discipline, with the Churches of Scotland and England. Little as we apprehend such a result, it may be well to keep it before the Church, that Connecticut became part and parcel of our happy federation of dioceses, on the ground of that all important principle of our Prayer-Book, which is expressed in its preface as follows : THIS CHURCH IS FAR FROM INTENDING TO DEPART FROM THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN ANY ESSENTIAL POINT OF DOCTRINE, DISCIPLINE, OR WORSHIP ; OR FURTHER THAN LOCAL CIRCUMSTANCES REQUIRE. As Connecticut Churchmen, therefore, we rejoice that bane was not left to be counteracted by bane ; and that this pestilent poison, and its pestilent antidote, were rebuked together, in the columns of the New York Churchman, by a correspondent, in whose vigorous style and critical acumen, were immediately recognized a genius and orthodoxy inherited with the blood of Seabury, by the late able Editor of that journal. Circumstances, which need hardly be particularized, gave great weight to such an article, from such a source, at such a time ; the writer was warmly welcomed back to his congenial work of vindicating Apostolic Truth against the assailants of its either flank ; and the ephemeral contribution soon fell into its place in the controversy, as a copyrighted pamphlet, entitled, *Confession as held by the Anglican Church*. It killed both adversaries. It convicted the former reply of a double blunder ; of a blunder in admitting the professed "Voice of the Anglican Church" to be a genuine exhibition of Anglican teaching, and of a worse blunder in attacking it by an attempt to array the American Church against the Church of England. At the same time it nobly illustrated the correct principle of the unity of the two Churches, by the power with which it vindicated the misrepresented doctrines of our venerable Mother, and showed that they require no apology. We scorn the cowardice and ingratitude that consents to fight a Romanizer, by surrendering to his purposes the honor and purity of the Church from whose venerable martyrs and doctors we have received our faith and worship ; and we admire the fidelity which makes common cause with her, and without hesitation gives the lie to her traducers, and goes confidently into battle on this manly issue. It was in this way that Dr. Seabury's reply destroyed the corrupt "Voice of the Anglican Church," proving it to be a garbled and false quotation of Anglican Standards ; and nailing upon its front the disgraceful stigma of being "an attempt to make the liberty which the Church allows, a cover for the introduction of a practice which she has plainly repudiated ; to repre-



sent the exception as the rule, and to apply to the latter the commendations which were designed for the former, and thus to hold up the Church and her divines as approving and advocating a system which they have solemnly and deliberately renounced."

The state of feeling in the Church, at this juncture, growing out of the articles in the Calendar, created a pressure, under which some explanation of the base work thus annihilated, became absolutely necessary; and accordingly, a young presbyter of North Carolina, the Rev. Donald McLeod, supposed to be the penitentiary of the Religious Order already referred to, felt constrained to avow himself the writer of the Tract, and to represent his Bishop as responsible only for approving his undertaking, and for *appointing* a third person to see it through the press; which third party was made responsible for the more flagrant garblings of which the performance was convicted. But, to tangle the matter still further, Bishop Ives himself, knowing nothing of the purpose of Mr. McLeod to make this avowal, had addressed a *Letter to the Clergy of his Diocese*, in which he repudiated the obnoxious Tract in strong terms, and represented himself as having been induced to adopt it, and authorize its circulation, upon the credit of certain "presbyters of high standing, said to have been consulted in preparing it." At the same time he stamped the work with his indignant disapprobation, as an "unreal and deceptive view of the teaching on Confession, of the Anglican Fathers." As Mr. McLeod's representations were singularly inconsistent with this detailed disclaimer, that gentleman was thus left before the Church in a most painful position; but it was not without exciting some surprise, that his relief was, in a measure, afforded by the Bishop himself, who, in a second letter, addressed to his friend, the present "editor of the New York Churchman," stated that his *Letter to his Clergy* had been written "in haste and under some irritation," and also, that had he known of the acknowledgment of Mr. McLeod, (which however he had not seen,) he would have withheld that Letter. The Rt. Reverend Prelate further said—"I now frankly avow myself responsible for the arrangement by which the Tract was published, and my conviction that no responsibility can attach to the reverend author, beyond its simple compilation. Of this compilation I knew nothing till after it was made. Before publication, however, *it was submitted to me, and, under the idea of its entire fairness, received my approval.*" Here then was a very plain case. The Bishop had not taken the pains to verify the extracts, for he trusted

the presbyters associated with him, and they alone are responsible for the shame and reproach of the garbling and counterfeiting. But then the teaching of the tract itself was apparent on the face of it, and *that* the Bishop evidently approved, as coincident with his own, and illustrative of his Pastoral on the *Priestly Office*. For the *teaching* of the Tract then, the Bishop cannot but be held responsible; he did not discover any difference in it from his own views, when he examined it, and authorized it as an appendix to his own work; and we think it follows, that if the Tract was subsequently proved, to use his own words, "A deceptive view of the teaching of the Anglican Fathers," he himself is proved to have suffered from a like *deceptive view*, and to have identified it with his teaching. If a false view of Anglican doctrine squared with his own teaching, surely his own teaching was not real Anglican doctrine.

But while things hung in this mysterious suspense, and confused the vision of almost all spectators, the Diocesan Convention of North Carolina was held at Salisbury, and was there met by their Bishop. By a public act, they declared the Diocese in a "state of agitation and alarm," resulting from the impression that doctrines and practices had been introduced among them, at variance with the Liturgy and Articles of the Church. In concurrence with his Convention, the Bishop then issued a *Charge to his Clergy*, authorizing them, on returning to their flocks, to assure them that "no efforts should be wanting on his part, so long as God should give him jurisdiction in North Carolina, to hinder the inculcation of any doctrine, or the introduction of any practice, come from what quarter it might, not in strict accordance with the Liturgy of our Church, as illustrated and defined by those standards of interpretation, authorized by the Church itself." The Bishop added—"In respect to a particular question which has agitated the Diocese of late, the question of Auricular Confession, I may here express my conviction that the Book of Common Prayer, our Standard of Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship, does not authorize any Clergyman of this Church to teach or enforce such confession as necessary to salvation, and that the only confession which it authorizes, is the voluntary Confession of the penitent, in accordance with the exhortation in the Office for the Holy Communion." Deeply mystified as the whole affair thus became, by the form of a Charge, which seemed to turn upon other offenders, the responsibility which was supposed to belong to the Bishop himself, and to retract, without directly expressing it, the teaching of the Pastoral,

and the purpose of the McLeod pamphlet, the minds of Churchmen generally were disposed to be satisfied with the strong assurances of the Charge, and to look confidently to its thorough enforcement in future episcopal acts. This confidence was strengthened by the announcement that "the Order of the Holy Cross" was dissolved, and by the belief that the Bishop had been, in some degree, the victim of his benevolent efforts, to satisfy and retain in the Church, by means of ingenious theories, the young and disaffected Clergy who composed that Order. That a deep interest in such young men might become almost morbid, might express itself with dangerous latitude, in order to comprehend their deviations from strict fidelity; might, by them, be used only as an *encouragement* to further departures, and might thus involve their patron in strange inconsistencies, seems the natural suggestion of experience and reflection. And, in reviewing these facts, we are inclined to adopt the suggestion, as the most favorable one; as explaining subsequent events most naturally, and as least uncharitable to the Bishop himself, hitherto the object of such general affection and regard.

We deeply regret the disturbance of the composure, which, so far as the Bishop of North Carolina is concerned, was beginning to be settled, by the appearance of another Pastoral, addressed to the Clergy and Laity of his Diocese, which severely reprobates not only the action of the Salisbury Convention, but also his own action, in responding to their censures, by assurances of his personal fidelity. Such an assurance he characterizes as *a humiliating act*, for which he apologizes, as the result of a severe illness, under which he was suffering when the Charge was dictated. He asserts that the censures of the Convention were notoriously aimed at himself, as "the chief offender," and thus gives a remarkable comment to his own *Charge*, which turned those censures upon others, and exhibited the Bishop as their severe castigator. He states very clearly his views of the limits in which our Diocesan Conventions exercise their powers, and points out the remedies against false teaching which the Church has established. He then enters on the whole subject of Absolution and Confession, and discusses it in a manner which we can neither commend nor satisfactorily explain. As an exception to the rule of Pastorals; as being virtually addressed to the whole Church, and a Pastoral only in name; as appearing in the form of any other publication, and offered for sale for general circulation, by a New York publishing house, we conceive it fairly open to review. We would only say of it,

however, that it appears to us to be a desperate attempt to reconcile the Bishop's position towards his monastic friends of "the Holy Cross," with his position towards his diocese and the Church, as defined in the Prayer-Book and Ordinal. By the former he is tied and bound to certain statements which he has either made, or allowed to be made in his behalf, by them. By the latter he is held to doctrines and principles which they secretly hate, and wish to destroy. The Bishop is resolved to hold fast to each; and so he boldly cites the Prayer-Book, and our standard divines, to prove, what nobody denies, the doctrine of the Keys, and its importance to the Church; and then leaps to the conclusion, that the Church's doctrine sustains his own. As if there were no proof that his own teaching agreed only with "an *unreal* and *deceptive* view of the teaching, or confession, of the Anglican Fathers," the Rt. Rev. author disavows the imputation of having given up, in his *Charge*, the teaching of his *Pastoral*, and other writings, and solemnly asserts that he "has not retreated *one step*! and will not, for any consideration this side the grave, yield one word or syllable of what he has really taught." As the McLeod pamphlet taught error, and yet agreed with the Bishop's *Pastoral*, we cannot see how this stand can be made good; and if that false view of Anglican teaching suited his purposes, we do not see how he can now appeal to a correct view of Anglican teaching, as equally illustrative of the meaning and intent which lie so near his heart.

But this *Pastoral*, in some respects the most extraordinary communication ever addressed by a Bishop to his Clergy and Laity, contains much besides, to convince the reader of his being committed to practices which may well account for unsoundness in his doctrines. It acknowledges the existence of "the Order of the Holy Cross," and, in part, details the history of its origin, and of his connection with it as its Superior. It admits the vows of obedience, celibacy, and poverty, to be those under which the Society is organized; and also that its *perpetual* members are necessarily *unmarried men*; it implies their unsettled state of mind and dangerous position, when they were thus organized, and enumerates *Sacerdotal Absolution* among the doctrines which they were to unite in promulgating. Now by their fruits they must be judged. It cannot be too much to presume that the McLeod pamphlet contains the doctrine of *Sacerdotal Absolution*, which the Order of the Holy Cross was bound to "inculcate upon the minds of all within their influence;" nor is it unfair to recur to its identity with the teaching discovered in the *Pastoral* of the

Bishop, on "the Priestly Office," viz. (1) the necessity of a special and particular confession to a priest, and (2) of the judicial nature of Sacerdotal *acceptance*, or Absolution. Now this latter Pastoral is dated at *Valle Crucis*, which the Bishop allows to be the Head Quarters of the Order, and which he so identifies with the Order, that we do not see how one can be *bonâ fide* abolished, and the other remain; and this date confirms our impression that the Bishop has acted under the conflicting influences of inharmonious functions; at Salisbury, against his monks, and at *Valle Crucis*, against his Clergy and Laity. Accordingly, in the *Valle Crucis* Pastoral, the Bishop, who admits and defends the fact that he "never speaks, or writes, against the Romanists," speaks and writes in a very unfilial manner of the Church of which he is a Bishop, and exhibits her as entirely stripped of her clothing of wrought gold, in such a way as to afford great delight to the Romanists, in whose newspapers the Bishop's disloyal concessions are already greedily licked up, and foully spirted back into the face of our venerable Mother. It is impossible for us, after reading this Letter, to consider the Bishop's unfortunate effort as any thing less than part of a movement, of which the Order, and the McLeod pamphlet, and certain practices in New York, were part and parcel, and of which the object, gradually adopted and favored by the Bishop, was the restoration, to our Communion, of Sacramental Penance. This judgment appears to coincide with the opinions of several able reviewers who have subjected it to candid but searching criticism; and omitting other notices which it has called forth, we deem it proper to say a few words with respect to three pamphlets which have appeared in quick succession, at this stage of the controversy. We refer to those of the Rev. Mr. Hanson, of Waddington, Judge Badger, of North Carolina, and the Rev. Dr. Jarvis, of this Diocese. One censure has been audible in certain quarters, which would affect them all, and ourselves also; it is intimated that we have no right to reply to a Bishop's official teachings; but to this we plead the all sufficient example of Law, whose share in the Bangorian Controversy is no disgrace to him, in the Church's esteem, and who is quoted with respect by Bishop Ives himself, but who did not scruple to appeal to the *reason* of Bishop Hoadley's Laity, against the *dogmatism* of their erring father in God. Mr. Hanson has proved, we think conclusively, the first point which we have already instanced, namely, that the Bishop teaches *the necessity of a special and particular confession to a priest*, or to throw it into Mr. Hanson's own conception of

the subject, the Bishop teaches specific confession to a priest, (either in the face of the whole Church, or in the merciful secrecy of the confessional,) to be an integral and essential part of true repentance. He also appears to us to convict the Bishop of endeavoring to fix this idea of repentance upon the Church's exhortations, so that when the Church exhorts to repentance, she should be understood as exhorting to Sacramental Penance; or to repentance, at least, in the scholastic sense, as including Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction, and involving what is generally understood by the System of Auricular Confession. The "Examination" of Judge Badger is evidently less the work of a theologian than of a lawyer, and hence we regard it as important, chiefly for the light which it throws upon facts, and for the evidence which it contains, corroborative of the opinion that "the Order of the Holy Cross," however insignificant in the number and character of its associates, has become the Bishop's snare in which his foot is taken, "so that he cannot do the things that he would." If, however, it shall yet appear that he has been voluntary in all to which they have committed him, the case is far worse; and we think it prudent to say nothing on this point, save that if the Order be what appears from the Judge's pamphlet, and if the Bishop defends them in their Romanizing practices, the conclusion is irresistible that we do him no wrong, in regarding his own teaching as coincident with that of Mr. McLeod, and essentially Romish.

But we are more than all gratified with the *Voice from Connecticut*, which Dr. Jarvis has put forth, with the approbation of our Diocesan. It is long since any thing has come before the Church with more venerable authority, and we think the work itself will be a permanent contribution to our Church Literature. It is a temperate, but powerful remonstrance, and a dignified vindication of Anglican doctrine. Its historical parts are a rich elucidation of some peculiarities of the American Prayer-Book, and of the relations of this Diocese to the residue of our American Church. It shows the inseparable connection between Absolution and the Sacraments, and the miserable shifts of Rome, in elevating it into a Sacrament, essentially complete in itself; and it fixes, we think, by necessary implication, a severe censure upon the views of the Pastoral which it controverts. As it will probably have a wide circulation, we deem it unnecessary to say more than that we are exceedingly gratified to see the campaign of 1849 so effectually closed, by a *Voice from Connecticut*, sustaining and fortifying the position taken by presbyters of this diocese so



early in the conflict, and reviving the principles of 1789, to oppose precisely opposite tendencies. From the same geographical quarters that then complained of the Anglican Prayer-Book as Popish, we now hear complaints that it is Puritan! Connecticut, that would not brook the one outcry then, resents the other now. We trust that the God who was with our fathers, will be still with us, and that his providence will overrule the present controversy, to the illustration of principles that cannot be moved, and to the settling of all parts of the Church, in greater uniformity of practice, and more perfect harmony of theological opinion.

The extraordinary pamphlet entitled "the Sacrament of Repentance," in which the argument is coolly reduced to a mere *petitio principii*, is not otherwise worthy of notice, than as it honestly avows, what the whole movement means. The writer apparently knows nothing of the connection between Absolution and the Sacraments of Repentance, "ordained by Christ himself," but simply affirms the Romish doctrine of Penance, and its absolute identity with Scripture and the Fathers. This, to say the least, is coming to the point.

And this brings us to the point where we are permitted to drop our historical retrospect, and to meet the *Valle Crucis* doctrine on our chosen position, that of the Anglican Standards. The McLeod pamphlet appeals to the English Prayer-Book, and its strong language about Absolution. Shall we therefore give it up, and own that our venerable reformers did not know what they were about, and that they were half Papists after all? Shame on such a craven way of meeting such a foe! No! Turn upon the gainsayers, and tell them flatly that the English Prayer-Book does not suit them at all; that they abhor it, and only pretend to appeal to it; that *the doctrine they have at heart* is refuted by every page of it; and that they cannot use it, according to its rubrics, with any conscience. Why so? Do they say the English Prayer-Book contains the form *I absolve thee*, which the Council of Trent, subsequently to the compilation of the Prayer-Book,\* declared to be of the essence of the Sacrament? Yes, but it also contains at least one other form of absolution which it regards as equivalent, and hence asserts that absolution has no sacramental form, and hence is no sacrament; implying also that the strongest form is used *ministerially*, and not *judicially*, and hence conflicting with another fulmination of

---

\* Let it never be forgotten that the Romish doctrine, as now imposed, is a thing which took shape at the Council of Trent, after our first Prayer-Book was set forth.



Trent, which declares absolution, unlike every other priestly function, a *judicial* act, and which pronounces the more ancient forms insufficient, even hypothetically, except they be uttered with a *judicial* intent. The Romanizer knows he does not like any thing in the Prayer-Book upon this subject, except the mere words—*I absolve thee from all thy sins*; nor even there, till he has joined them to the sins confessed by the dying penitent, in order to get the essential parts of a sacrament, and then loaded the form with a meaning which it is no man's prerogative to usurp, for it belongs alone to the Judge who binds and looses by powers inherent, and according to Omniscient wisdom. Throughout the Prayer-Book Absolution is a ministerial act, just as baptism is; and it is administered freely upon a general confession, so that it sustains thoroughly the very doctrine of Absolution and Confession which Trent has subsequently anathematized. It is impossible for any one with Tridentine theology in his heart, to admire the Anglican Prayer-Book, so far as Penance is concerned.

Now then does the Bishop of North Carolina simply regret that the formularies of the American Church are weak, and endeavor to call up his flock to the fullness of doctrine still contained in them, as illustrated by the original standards, from which they do not essentially depart? If he does, he will find no antagonists in us; for little as we admire any thing that ministers to discontent, we admire very much an honest, earnest effort, to teach men sound doctrine in any way. But he is so far gone with the Romanizers, that he by no means does this; but, on the contrary, he lets out his dissatisfaction with the English Prayer-Book in no measured terms. He astonishes us by charging our reformers with conceding *essential truth*, on this vital subject, to "the Lutheran or Puritan mind." And in great disregard of historical verity, he asserts that "the doctrine of Sacerdotal Absolution was cast into the shade, when *its true and proper form* was removed from general use, into the Order for the Visitation of the Sick."\* Here then we come at the marrow of the Bishop's doctrine. *I absolve thee*, is the "true and proper form" of Absolution! Why so? It was not so decided by any authority when the Prayer-Book was compiled. It was not so used even in the Latin Churches, till the twelfth century. Why then is this *the true and proper form*, and why was the doctrine of Sacerdotal Absolution cast into the shade, when it was left just where it was for eleven hundred years after

---

\* See Pastoral Letter to Clergy and Laity.

CHRIST, throughout Christendom? We can conceive no possible answer, save that the form *I absolve thee* is capable of judicial force, and is so united with confession, *in that one Office*, that a sacrament can be made of it, while in every other place the Prayer-Book unavoidably puts the priest under the subsequent curse of Trent, viz. *Si quis dixerit, absolutionem sacramentalem sacerdotis non esse actum judiciale aut dixerit non requiri confessionem pœnitentis (i. e. confiteri omnia et singula peccata mortalia) ut sacerdos eum absolvere possit; anathema sit!*

It is true, the Bishop does not always seem consistent with himself, for he adopts, in another place, the opinion that "*it matters little whether the Church's ministers are to be understood as praying or preaching, judging or declaring*, seeing their instrumentality is employed by the Most High in bestowing on penitent believers the gift of pardon."\* If this be true, why does he scout the deprecativè and declarative forms, and call the indicative the only "true and proper form?" It will be seen, on referring to the passage, that he guards his admission, with the *caveat*, that it matters little, *provided* such and such a meaning be attached; and this is precisely the way the Romish theologians get over the more primitive forms, which were declarative or deprecativè, in words, but which they assert to have been *judicial* in intent. And it is to be observed, that by *judicial* is meant not a *judicial declaration*, like that of the priests in the Old Law, which is taught by some of our divines, and by Peter Lombard himself: it must be a *judicial collation*, says the Council of Trent, and to this agrees the *caveat* of the Bishop of North Carolina.

We cannot endure the thought that the Anglican Prayer-Book should suffer such an affront from a Bishop of our Church, as to be pronounced *Puritanized* throughout, on the all important subject of the reconciliation of sinners to God. As to Sacerdotal Absolution, (that is to say, the priestly act, in itself considered,) it was not affected in the least by the changes of successive books. As to Confession, which is another thing, it was altered; but it is only by the Romish error of making Confession and Absolution into one sacrament, that the Bishop can at all justify his assertion. The Puritans, who confound the two things, for other purposes, have always asserted that our forms of Absolution imply Romish Penance, and that hence, on that point, we are not reformed at all.

---

\* See Pastoral Letter to Clergy and Laity.

The Bishop is a more discriminating theologian, and because Confession and Absolution are less closely identified in the latter books, he finds the Romish sacrament wanting, and hence calls them Puritanized. He finds the priest an ambassador, but not a *judge*; and hence it is only in the formulary where the priest can be made to seem the reverse, that he recognizes a "true and proper form." Let us see how little the Prayer-Book suffers from such a sweeping censure.

The distinction between the Power of the Keys and the Discipline of Confession, though confounded by Papists and Puritans, is all important to the theologian. The one, involving Absolution with the Sacraments, is divine and unchangeable; the other is an ecclesiastical matter, left to the wisdom of the Church, and subject from the beginning to changes and improvements, not only in the Church at large, but in particular provinces and dioceses.

Absolution may be generally defined as a benediction of the New Law, renewing the baptismal gift of pardon to the penitent transgressor, and making him a worthy partaker of the Holy Eucharist,\* so that he may live or die in full communion with the Church. Confession is public or private acknowledgment of sin, in order to the pardon of God, and according to the provisions of the Church. Now as to the former, (Absolution,) we simply state the fact, that, so far from being Puritanized, the Prayer-Book retains the ancient forms of the Church of England, which she used long before the Reformation, to this day; and amongst them, though the least ancient of all, the very forms on which the Church of Rome so strenuously insists. As to the latter, (Confession,) we assert that although avowedly less complete than she desires to become, she has done nothing unwarranted by precedent, or contrary to the mind of antiquity, but that she still retains a very sufficient system of Confession, and a system all the better, because it is free from the nature of compulsory and sacramental Penance. These statements we will now make good, and we do it with the instinctive loyalty of sons, maintaining parental honor against an unfilial invasion.

Sacerdotal Absolution was not cast into the shade by the Reformers. They preserved its ancient forms, and brought it into stronger prominence as they advanced. We speak now of *Absolution*, in itself. In the Ordinal, they preserved the

---

\* The connection between Absolution and the Eucharist was prominent in all the old penitentials, and in the Visitation Office of 1549. Marshall quotes Morinus for the assertion, it was long before Absolution was in point of time separated from the Eucharist.

form of its divine institution, and conveyed the Power of the Keys in the very words of Christ: *Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained.* The corresponding form was never in any place but the Visitation Office, and there it stands still. The deprecativ form was in the first Communion Office, and there it stands still. In the second book, the declarative form was added to these, in the Daily Prayer, but not substituted for them; and even that form, pronounced by the priest standing, and added to the former absolution, is far from throwing the doctrine of Sacerdotal Absolution into the shade! Whatever influences had been brought to bear upon them, the Reformers were more than blameless in this matter; for in the system of Absolutions which they thus completed, they suited the forms to the several occasions, with admirable propriety. True, the ministerial agency of the Absolution was prominent throughout; but even Rome had not then condemned the Master of the Sentences, and many of her own divines, on this matter.\* As the priest administered baptism "for the remission of sins," so he administered Absolution for the renovation of baptism; but he was no more a *judge* in absolving, than in baptizing. He was, in both, the minister of God's pardoning mercy, certifying and conveying forgiveness to the truly penitent, but leaving the question of penitence to the Searcher of hearts. He said *I absolve thee*, just as he said *I baptize thee*: and, in either case, what was *bound on earth* was only conditionally *bound in heaven*.

On this principle then, a *quasi* Absolution was provided for the daily service, to be used twice a day; and in this the spirit of the old English Breviaries was faithfully carried out. Thus the congregation, at the very door of worship, were reminded of their need of daily renovation, and were not permitted to say *Our Father*, until, after a penitential confession, they had been, as it were, restored to their baptism. But as in a mixed congregation the truly penitent, and those who were designing to communicate, would probably be the few, "the true and proper form" of Absolution, in that place, was precisely the weakest which faith might apprehend, for to use a stronger would be *casting pearls before swine*. It answered its purpose in all respects, suggesting to the impenitent the means of grace, and conveying to the true believer the assurance of remission.

---

\* St. Thomas Aquinas tries to excuse Peter Lombard, but modern Romish writers condemn him, just as they do us. Thus, for example, Dens says, flatly, "*Non sufficit etiam cum Magistro Sententiarum admittere declarationem judicalem.*"

To the latter, it restored the *spirit of adoption whereby we cry Abba, Father*, and hence it was immediately followed by the Lord's Prayer. Thus this *quasi* Absolution was in all respects fitted to its place; and as near as possible, in spirit, identical with the *quasi* absolutions of the Breviary, which are "uniformly in the shape of *petitions* to Almighty God, and *include the minister using them*, being worded in the first, not the second person." This is the testimony of the Oxford Tract writers, whose words we quote; but what degree of Puritanism would not have been charged upon our Daily Prayer, had its Absolution been precisely similar? The reformers knew what they were about. They ordered the *minister* to stand when he pronounced even this Absolution, and by *minister* was then understood the priest; and thus they distinctly made the act a sacerdotal one. But supposing they had not? Supposing this Absolution had been a precatory one, in which before the priest absolved the people, the people had seemed, by their suffrages, to absolve the priest? Oh, what changes would be rung now-a-days upon the names of Bucer, Peter Martyr, and the other meddlers! How every young gentleman whose Deacon's Orders are surmounted by the orders and the cassock of the Holy Cross, would feel himself bound to expatiate on the Puritan and Lutheran mind of the Reformers! But now this is not the case in the Matins and Evensong of the Church of England; but it is the case in the Prime and Compline Service of the Breviary. There, *after the minister's confession, the people say to the priest*, "God Almighty have mercy upon thee, absolve thee from thy sins, and bring thee safe to life everlasting!" There—of course, it is all right, highly Catholic, truly primitive! It is strange how many things are beautiful and significant in the Romish Breviary, which would be abominated in the Prayer-Book. The Oxford writers admire this peculiarity in the Latin services, and explain it very ingeniously. "In the *quasi* Absolution, after the stated confession at Prime and Compline, it is to be noticed," say they, "that the people absolve the priest, *before, and in the same words in which the priest absolves the people*, as if vindicating to the body of Christians that sacramental power, (whatever may be its degree,) which might have seemed inconsistent with the special stress laid by Romanism on Sacerdotal gifts."\* Why, in the Prayer-Book this would be flat Congregationalism! In the Oxford Tracts, and the Roman Breviary, we trust it may be taken as

---

See Tract No. 75, pp. 193-225, Am. edition.

an offset to the Bishop of North Carolina's aspersions of our Daily Service.

But while in the service which answered to the Breviary, the *spirit* of the Breviary was retained, so far as Absolution is concerned; the office for Holy Communion, designed for communicants alone, rose to a higher solemnity, and required the Bishop (or, in his absence, the priest) to rise, after the Confession, and to pronounce the Absolution in words almost identical with the Absolution in the old Missals, but in a manner more sacerdotal. The Latin formula is simply—"God Almighty have mercy upon you, absolve you from your sins, and bring you safe to everlasting life;" and the same form, in our Communion Office, comes from the Missal of Sarum,\* in which it had been used by English priests for hundreds of years before the Reformation. No stronger form was used even in the Roman Church, until the twelfth century.

But as there were public Absolutions for the faithful, so for the criminal and the lapsed, there was the Law of the leper. If any man was staying away from Holy Communion, because of some secret sin, or grievous impediment, he was exhorted to come to the priest, and "receive the benefit of Absolution, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness." The first Prayer-Book was, if any thing, more qualified, forewarning *the hypocrite* that "the Absolution of the priest could nothing avail him;" but the second Prayer-Book retained the exhortation we have quoted, and it has been retained ever since in the English Prayer-Book, though to remove all occasion of cavil to weak brethren, the form is modified in our own.

Nor, had the reformers any scruple to the form *I absolve thee*, which, though little more than a ritual novelty, in those days, was still Scriptural, and consistent with the Ordinal. So long as its force was not considered judicial, which it was not then decided to be, even by the Papists, there could have been no objection, but prejudice, to its use. Accordingly, in the case of a dying penitent, tempted to the capital sin of despair, and needing a staff to comfort him in the dark valley, the priest was authorized to use this form, if specially requested. As, to an unbaptized penitent, he might say, *I baptize thee*, so, to the baptized penitent, *I absolve thee*.† In either case he

\* See Liturgy of Sarum, &c. by Maskell, London, 1844. Palmer also cites an ancient Greek form. *Origines*, ii, 109.

† See this very clearly put by Bingham, who certainly is very moderate. Book xix, chap. ii, 6.

was but the *minister of reconciliation*, and true penitence and faith were the express conditions; but in the last conflict, when Satan often makes his last onsets, and strives to shake the weak soul, by the weak body, there was special utility in bestowing the strongest assurance of faith, "lest for any pains of death," the dying should fall from Christ. Even the non-conformist, Dr. Reynolds, when he came to the shadow of death, felt the need of this strong staff, and begged to receive it, and did so.\* Perhaps he took it with a "Lutheran or Puritan mind," but there is no ground for accusing the reformers of providing it, in such a mind; for as Trent had not then condemned "the Master of the Sentences," they were certainly not to blame if they believed with Peter Lombard, that "God alone remits and retains sins, and although He hath given to the Church the power of binding and loosing, He binds and looses in one way, and the Church in another. For He only, of himself, remits sins, Who both cleanses the soul from inward taint, and releases it from the penalty of eternal death. But this He hath not conceded to priests; to whom, nevertheless, He hath conceded power to bind and loose, that is, to *declare men bound or loosed*."† Wherefore the Lord first, of Himself, restored the leper, and then sent him to the priests, by whose judgment he might be declared clean." This was not heterodoxy, even in Rome, before the Council of Trent; but since then, Romish doctors condemn us, and the elder school-men together. It certainly would be hard to find any reputable English doctor, who makes less of Sacerdotal Absolution.

Thus, without any idea of Tridentine subtleties, did the Anglican Church wisely suit "the true and proper form" of her ministrations to the diverse wants and cases which arise in the life and death of faithful men. She had no idea of *special words*, as necessary to Absolution, because she did not regard it as, in itself, a sacrament. The reformers perfectly understood themselves, and at every step kept Antiquity in view; and hence, in our opinion, it is to be regretted that so wise and harmonious a system of Absolution should have been disturbed by our American Reviewers, in the spirit of less genuine reformation. The second form of Absolution is now thrust into the Daily Service, to which it is not at all appropriate, and the third form is omitted; but it should be observed

\* See Fuller's account of his death, Church Hist. Vol. III, 231.

† The original words are—"potestatem solvendi et ligandi, id est, ostendendi homines ligatos vel solutos." Petri Lombardi Senten. Lib. IV, p. 377. Paris, 1845.



that the prayer in the Visitation Office, which contains the expression *impute not unto him his former sins, &c.*, is in fact a very ancient Anglican form of Absolution,\* (retained from the Penitential of Ecbert, Archbishop of York, in A. D. 731,) and as such may be used with *ministerial* authority, and in connection with either of the other forms, which the rubric allows to be introduced. It must be remembered also, that the Clergy of Connecticut solemnly resolved to conform to the English book, in all cases, as closely as our own rubrics permit. They were not willingly a party to a mutilation, which, by the known laws of action and reaction, has entailed upon this generation a contest with some who sneer at even the originals, and who would alter the old Anglican Standards to suit the more modern standards of the Church of Rome, and the mere caprices of Trent.

Now, as to Confession. Regarding its form as a matter of Christian discipline, and in no wise of divine prescription, the Anglican Church, following the example of antiquity, and using her own lawful powers as an independent patriarchate, abolished the practice of obligatory private confession, which had become scandalous, and substituted another discipline, more like the primitive. In her Communion, she expressed herself, in so many words, as desirous of restoring the "godly discipline which was in the Primitive Church, for putting notorious sinners to open penance," and she advanced as far as the times would permit, towards the object. The requirements of Confession, in the great congregation, as part of daily prayer, may be accounted for, as a further step towards completing her penitential system. Scandalous and grievous sins, by which the offender was self-excommunicated, were subjected to the ordinance of voluntary private confession, to which the exhortation in the Communion Office expressly invited; and finally, at the threshold of Communion itself, after the exhortation to self-judgment, a full and audible confession was exacted of all communicants, in which, while the mouth *confessed unto justification*, in general terms, the heart should be specific, and accuse itself of particular sins, under the terms, *by thought, word, and deed*. Finally, in order to his dying in perfect charity with all the world, and at peace with God, the dying believer is moved "to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter;" and in all these Confessions, appropriate Absolutions are provided. Such is "the sweetness" with

---

\* See the whole in Marshall's Penitential Discipline, p. 222.

which, as Dr. Donne observes, our Church *moves* the penitent, instead of dragging him in chains to the confession of his sins. If then we would manfully turn upon our foes, instead of standing upon a tame defensive, we should take from them the armor, wherein they trust, and divide their spoils. Let us challenge our use of the texts about Remission and the Keys, to be the true, by the testimony of twelve hundred years preceding the Lateran Council, against the usage of three hundred years between that council and our reformation. Let us try the systems by antiquity; by St. Ambrose repelling Theodosius at the Church door, contrasted with a pardon-mongering monk, with his ear against the whispering hole of the confessional, or thumbing the pages of his casuist, to settle how much *satisfaction* is "nominated in the bond." Let us not avoid, but insist upon, the test of Old Testament prefigurations. Do they appeal to the purifications and expiations of the Old Law, as types of the discipline of the New? Let us agree to it. The Old Law had one discipline for the great congregation, and another for the leper. So have we. For the true Israelites, we have the General Confessions, the Ash-Wednesday humiliations, the responses to the Decalogue, and the General Absolutions, which answer to the sprinkling of the people with the hyssop and the blood, and scarlet wool. For the unclean, the lapses, the sore conscience, the plague-stricken soul, we have the exhortation, *Go, show thyself to the priest*; and the priest has the means of grace to receive him, and by God's blessing, "to recover him of his leprosy." But the Church of Rome has nothing for the leper, to separate him from the clean. The law of leprosy, is the law of her faithful. *Omnis utriusque sexus fidelis—saltem, semel in anno—omnia sua peccata!* This is the Lateran scourge, that drives the whole flock, all lepers together, once a year, to show themselves to the priest, and to pay the consideration. The tribunal of penance soon relieves their consciences, but not as He did, who said, *thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace*. That is no place for the broken and the contrite heart; certainly not for him who cries with the Psalmist, *who can understand his errors; cleanse thou me from my secret faults*. Let us then rest so far satisfied with what we have, as to say with gratitude of our condition what Wake said to Bossuet:—"The Church of England refuses no sort of Confession, either public or private, which may be any way necessary to the quieting of men's consciences, or to the exercising that power of binding and loosing which our Saviour Christ has left to his Church."

We conclude, therefore, that the Penitential System of our Reformed Church, although avowedly a mere approximation to the godly discipline of primitive times, is by no means an insufficient one. As a whole, taken in connection with the observance of Lent, and Passion Week, and of other fasts, and seen in the unbroken order of the English Prayer-Book, it has a unity and beauty which compares not unfavorably with the discipline of better days; and we may adopt once more the language of Wake, and assert fearlessly that "as to Penance and Confession, the canons of our Church do perhaps require as much as the Primitive Christians themselves did, and it is more the decay of piety, than any want of care in her, that they are not as well and regularly practised." Would to God our enthusiasts, instead of breeding distrust of the means of grace we so richly enjoy, would set us an example of faithfully employing them! The *spirit* of antiquity was not to magnify the priest, nor yet to multiply crimes and penalties; but only to restore the sick, to elicit genuine penitence, and to prevent scandal. Hence, when public confession became a greater scandal than the sin itself, the Church substituted voluntary private confession, which answered until the thirteenth century. If a Synod of Lateran could establish a compulsory penance then, why could not a Synod of London, after three hundred years' experience of worse scandal than before, revert to the older practice? This is, in fact, the change which was made at the Reformation; and let us thank God for it. The discipline which was thus superseded, had proved a deplorable invention. It failed to elicit genuine contrition, and by the facility with which it relieved the conscience, it tended to the increase of crime. The universal degradation of morals was its natural result, and the corrupt casuistry of the Jesuits its legitimate product. Compare Italy and England. Compare their ecclesiastics; compare their laity; compare their social institutions. In which country is marriage most sacred? In which is property; in which is female purity; in which is human life most inviolable? In which country is there most conscience and most fear of God? In England, Dissent has always obstructed the operation of her system; in Italy, the system of Sacramental Penance is strictly observed. By their fruits, nevertheless, let them be known. Where the Romish system is best carried out, there men are worst. The Confessional is a mere sponge. They go to wash out the old score, and begin anew. The three parts of penitence are no longer genuine contrition, voluntary confession, and honest satisfaction; but, instead thereof, we find the priest

enforcing the sufficiency of a mere Attrition, the necessity of servile Enumeration, and the equivalency of pecuniary Commutation. Is this the system by which sin is made exceeding sinful. Let any one study the *practical* theology of Rome, upon this matter, and he will see that she is—what the Church's Spouse is not—the *minister of sin*. The harlot "wipeth her mouth and saith, I have done no wickedness;" the dog returns to his vomit, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire; but their filth is left with the priest; yes with him who stands daily at the altar, and should have clean hands and a pure heart, and to whom it is said, *be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord*. We use the Saxon of the Scriptures, and let no foppish Romanizer call it coarse. But we beg to remind him that the youthful monk, who would qualify himself for a Romish priest, must commit to memory the rhymes of the blackguard and the flat prose of the stew. Such are the literal qualifications of a Confessor, or "penitentiary," in the Latin Church; and if any one denies it, we will dare him to render into English, before any decent person, a single page of a Tractate, now lying before us, which is the authorized text-book of the Seminarians at Malines. Enough to settle the whole question between us and Rome, with regard to Penance, is the fact, that their system requires of the priest such an intimacy with sins that should have no name, that the reading of their casuistry, even in a dead language, is repugnant to every instinct of a gentleman, to say nothing of the conscience of a Christian.

## CHURCH REVIEW.

---

### EDITORIAL

THE present number completes the second volume of the "CHURCH REVIEW AND ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER." The two years which have elapsed since its establishment, will long be marked, as forming an era in the history of the world. On the continent of Europe, events have transpired, and are still going on, less important in their social and political bearing, in which respect they are generally considered, than in their present and prospective influence upon the Church of CHRIST. Italy, France, Germany, Hungary, Austria, Russia, and Turkey, to the Christian eye, which perceives the workings of an Unseen Hand in the commotions of the nations, present a view of absorbing interest. In Great Britain, we witness the steady incursions of a worldly and political policy, upon the power and prerogatives of the Church; and yet, at the same time, the waking up of energies, and the exhibition of a zeal on the part of the Church, which remind us of the scenes of Apostolic days. At home, our own nation presents a growth unparalleled in history, in the vast increase of her population, in her progress in all the great departments of active enterprise, and in her cultivation of the Sciences and the useful and ornamental Arts. The Church, of which we are the humble servants, is already occupying a commanding position in our country; and by her conservative character is winning increasing respect and confidence. In comparison with the feeble efforts employed, her advancement has been in the highest degree encouraging. Especially are we called upon to notice a growing spirit of unity and of cordial attachment to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, as they are embodied in our Primitive standards, and exhibited in the practical workings of the Church system; nor is it just occasion of surprise or alarm, that, in the vigorous and healthful development of her true principles, a few unstable minds should have passed over, into one or the other of the extremes by which the Church is surrounded.

With the first number of the third Volume, the plan of the Review will be extended, to include a department of "AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY," to be sustained by the Rev. Francis L. Hawks, D. D., LL. D. The first paper will be a History of the Organization of the Church in Pennsylvania, from the pen of the late Rt. Rev. Bishop White, and deposited in the hands of Dr. Hawks. These

Historical Articles will be secured by copy-right for the benefit of the Author. Knowing, as we do, the value of the materials in the possession of Dr. Hawks, we assure our readers that these contributions will be worth many times the cost of the entire work; and while the arrangement will increase the size of the Review, and impose upon us no inconsiderable additional expense, the price to subscribers will remain as heretofore. We look to the friends of the Review to sustain the effort, by increasing the circulation of the work.

In looking forward to the labors of a new year, we have no change to announce in respect to the principles upon which the Review will be conducted; unless it be a firmer determination, to resist resolutely the introduction of all novelties in doctrine and in practice; to adhere tenaciously to the positive teachings of the Church; and to guard the pages of the Review from every thing like the influence of partisan spirit, views, and measures. It must be obvious that the broad and catholic basis upon which the Review professes to stand, imposes a stronger obligation to observe with great distinctness the boundaries by which we actually are limited, lest that spirit of tolerance and charity, which the Church allows, shall degenerate into a treacherous indifferentism. The teaching of the Review shall be positive, while it is Catholic; and its readers will not, we think, have reason to complain, that it lacks energy and boldness, even if it exhibit none of the blind zeal of mere partisanship. We aspire to making the Church Review an organ of permanent usefulness; by the high literary character of its pages; its pure, elevated moral sentiment; its uncompromising adherence to our primitive and reformed standards; its careful record of the progress of the Church, and of Missionary efforts; its fearless exposure of the errors and heresies of the age, of whatever name; its faithful defense of the great organizations of Society, the Family, the State, and the Church, against the assaults of an insidious and reckless radicalism; and, not least, by its constant inculcation of that which the Church especially needs, a living union with her Living HEAD.

Our list of Contributors, published and unpublished, comprising accomplished Divines, profound Scholars, and able Statesmen, presents a combination of talent such as, we hesitate not to say, graces the pages of no other Quarterly in this country; and the Review enters upon its future career, determined, in humble reliance upon the blessing of Him who has promised to be with His Church always, to win for itself the confidence of all true Churchmen.

In conclusion, we most gratefully acknowledge the assistance of the friends of the Review, in every section of our country, in aiding to extend its circulation; and beg to remind them, that it is still, in a great degree, dependent upon their kindly coöperation.

NEW HAVEN, January 1, 1850.

## ART. VII.—BOOK NOTICES.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION *of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, in its relation to Mankind, and to the Church.* By ROBERT ISAAC WILBERFORCE, A. M., Arch-Deacon of the East-Riding. First American, from the second London edition. Philadelphia: H. Hooker. 12mo. pp. 412. 1849.

We have seen no book recently issued from the English or American press, which is so sure to produce a deep and permanent impression in the Church. It is not, strictly speaking, a popular book; but it is one which will be studied and pondered by earnest and thoughtful minds; and it is one which will, to a considerable degree, mould and establish opinion. It is a book which could never have been written except at the present day; and is adapted to the present state of religious doctrine throughout nominal Christendom. It is a thoroughly learned book. With the ancient Fathers, the heathen Philosophers, and the German theologians, the author is equally at home. He has presented, what we have never seen done so completely before, the doctrine of the Incarnation of CHRIST, in its relations to the various heresies, ancient and modern, concerning it. The INCARNATION, as a great central fact of Revealed Religion, was the stone upon which the Sabellians, the Arians, and the Nestorians stumbled; and the Fifth Chapter, in which he treats of these heresies, and of the early Councils of the Church, is one of great ability and value. Having finished his consideration of the "Unity of Person between God the word, and the Son of Man," he enters upon the subject of His Mediation; of His Intercession; of His Spiritual Presence in His Church, or Body Mystical; of Common Worship, as a Means of Union with the Mystical Body of Christ; of Sacraments, as means of union with the Manhood of Christ; and of Christ as the source of Holiness and Knowledge to Mankind. On these great subjects, involving numerous points, concerning which there is some diversity, and more looseness of view, Mr. Wilberforce writes with great clearness and compactness. He not only knows how to distinguish, but he does distinguish, between what is *objective* and *subjective* in religion; and while his theme is the former, he shows that he does not lack appreciation of the latter. Indeed it is in this very respect that one chief excellency of the work consists; and in which its power on the public mind will rest. It looks at the objective parts of Christianity, not as abstractions, or as bare technicalities, or as the mere arbitrary frame-work of the System. On the contrary, CHRIST'S Institutions are presented as living realities, as His own methods through which His perpetual Intercession becomes available to us. He says, "If the Sacraments be thus emptied of their meaning, it is because the present teachings of Christ are not appreciated; and the purposes of His Incarnation are forgotten. And this forgetfulness again, may be traced to unbelief in that real diversity of persons in the Blessed Trinity, in which all creaturely existence has its ultimate root. Thus does a practical Sabellianism, respecting Christ's Person, coincide with that Rationalistic theory, by which the reality of His Sacraments is disputed. And their surrender is fatal to the true doctrine concerning Himself, even as the true doctrine of His nature sets the importance of these instruments in a proper light."

There is one respect in which we feel bound to remark upon Mr. Wilberforce's book. He has looked at the Incarnation objectively, in connection with a certain theory; a theory which, in our judgment, he has pushed quite too far; and which, as our readers will perceive, has certainly involved him in *conclusions* which are by no means to be received. It is fair to suppose that his premises must be false, or his reasoning defective. Thus he uses language like the following: "the Perpetual Presence which he promised to His servants" is "the Presence of His *Man's Nature*;" the "*sanctified humanity* of the Son of God exerts its renewing influence upon the defiled humanity of His brethren;" "that exhaustless grace



which was to be the principle of life to the whole renewed family, had its *fountain and well-head* in the *manhood* of the Son of God; "that *manhood* of Christ which is the principle of regeneration to all His brethren." And again, "the Sacraments, which are the means of binding us to the mystical Body of Christ derive their efficacy from the influence of His body Natural." Such language recognizes a theory concerning the ultimate cause, and the instrumental method of man's recovery from the effects of the apostasy, which we are not yet prepared to receive. There is a wide distinction between looking at the Cross of Christ, and looking at the *humanity* of Christ, as the "fountain" of Spiritual life. And there is a distinction between our incorporation into the mystical Body of Christ, the Church, in which we become partakers of the Divine Nature, and subjects of the Holy Spirit's renewing operations on the one hand, and looking upon the manhood of Christ, as "the principle of regeneration to all His brethren." It is not a distinction without a difference. It is the question of causality of our spiritual life. It is the Atonement purchased by *Christ*, and rendered effectual through His mystical Body on the one hand, and an Atonement by an incorporation into, and a participation in the virtues of, Christ's humanity on the other. We are not surprised then, to hear the author say, as his system obliges him to say, that "the *soul's regeneration*, like the body's growth, is of course a *protracted* process, which the whole of life is not too long to complete." And he might add, if not completed in this life, may be completed by some purgatorial process hereafter. A conclusion, we say, like this, which sets aside the received doctrine of Regeneration—which confounds Regeneration with Renovation—which conflicts, not only with our Baptismal Formula, but with the great mass of our standard Church theology, must proceed, either from false premises, or from incorrect reasonings. Nor is there any necessity for such a theory. The view of the Church, that we become partakers of the Divine Nature, not independently of, but through membership in the mystical Body of Christ, is a sufficient safeguard against Sabellianism, which overlooks this instrumentality, and makes our union with God a mere union with Deity at large.

Besides, there is another difficulty in the way of Mr. Wilberforce's theory. The office which he ascribes to the *human nature* of Christ, necessarily invests it with attributes which destroy its identity. And then, it needs but one step more, and that a short one, making the presence of Christ's human nature *material* as well as real; and we have at once a heresy which the Church expressly disowns and protests against.

As Hooker has been appealed to as sustaining this view of Wilberforce, we quote the following language, which certainly cannot be misunderstood. "It followeth, that nothing of Christ which is limited, that nothing created, that neither the soul nor the body of Christ, and consequently not Christ as man, or Christ according to his human nature, can possibly be everywhere present. \* \* \* Neither is the manhood of Christ, that subject whereunto universal presence agreeth. \* \* \* Christ is essentially present with all things, in that he is very God; but not present with all things as man." Book V, Ch. iv, s. 4. It is but fair, however, to say that Wilberforce anticipates the objections that we have urged; and intentionally guards against them. Hooker also says, "Presence by way of conjunction is in some sort presence;" and in this sense he speaks of a *sort of presence* of the human nature of Christ; but he is exceedingly cautious in his use of language, and prefaces his remarks by declaring, "We hold it in regard of the fore-alleged proofs, a most infallible truth, that Christ as man is not everywhere present." Certain it is, that the theory of Mr. Wilberforce, that the humanity of Christ is not only omnipresent in the Church, but present as the fountain of that exhaustless grace which is the principle of Regeneration, finds no support in the teachings of such a mind as Hooker's.

We wish also to say, that some of the best writers in the Church do not feel the force of the objections which we have urged against Mr. Wilberforce's theory; and we have on hand a commendatory review of the book, which we may publish in our next number. Beyond dispute the work is full of deep realities; one

which we earnestly commend to all thoughtful and earnest Christians. We should not be surprised to see the statement repeated, made in a late private letter—"No other work I ever read influenced my mind so much."

A PASTORAL LETTER to the Clergy and Laity of his Diocese. By the Rt. Rev. L. Silliman Ives, D. D., Bishop of North Carolina. New York, Stanford & Swords. 12mo. pp. 80.

The object of this Pastoral of Bishop Ives, appears to be two-fold. It is in part to protest against the doings of the Convention of his Diocese, which in his absence had reported through a Committee, "great agitation and alarm, arising from the impression that doctrines have been preached not in accordance with the Liturgy and Articles of this Church; and that ceremonies and practices have been introduced, either unauthorized by the customs of this Church, or in plain violation of its rubrics." Another cause of alarm was reported to be, the existence of a Society, "whose character, rules, and practices, are at variance with the spirit if not with the laws of this Church." Another object of this Pastoral, is to define the Bishop's own position in respect to certain doctrines and practices, and to state the origin and purposes of the Society alluded to.

Whether the Committee on the State of the Church transcended their limits in reporting what they believed to be the facts in the case, we shall not now attempt to determine; much less is it our purpose to allude to personal matters in the Pastoral letter, pertaining to the internal condition of the Diocese of North Carolina. But on the general subjects of Confession and Absolution, discussed in this Pastoral, we cannot hesitate to present what we believe to be the teaching of our Branch of Christ's Holy Church, with distinctness and earnestness. These are subjects pertaining to the Church, and to Churchmen everywhere; and which must and will be met with free and full discussion.

If we understand the Bishop of North Carolina he maintains the following points.

1st. The necessity of private Confession to a priest; not as required by the Church, but necessary by the moral wants of individuals.

2d. The general necessity of such Confession; or its necessity for all.

3d. He considers Confession as inseparable from Absolution, and having Absolution as its great end.

4th. That the priest has power *judicially* to remit sins.

5th. That Absolution confers grace.

6th. That this was the view concerning Confession held and taught in the early Church.

7th. That in this view he is sustained by the authority of the "judicious Hooker."

If we have misstated the Bishop's positions we have read his Pastoral Letter to little purpose.

We cannot in a brief notice examine each one of these points. But we say confidently, and hold ourselves ready to show that the above was not the view of Confession as taught by the early Church, or as maintained by Hooker. It has no support in the standards of the English Church, or our own; but is unequivocally condemned by both.

The early Church did not hold to the necessity of Confession to a priest, either public or private. They did not recommend it *generally*; as Hooker truly says, "Confession was neither looked for till men did offer it; nor offered, for the most part, by any other than such as were guilty of heinous transgressions; nor to them any time appointed for that purpose." Neither was Confession viewed as inseparable from Absolution, even on the part of these lapsed penitents. Hooker says, "it can nowhere be showed that the priest to whom secret information was given did reconcile or absolve any." The end of Confession was chiefly, the restitution of the penitent to his former right in the holy Sacrament; and it was sought also, because of the fervent desire on the part of the penitents "to be helped and assisted with the prayers of God's Saints."

Concerning judicial absolution on the part of the priest, Hooker says, "What

is then the force of absolution? What is it which the act of absolution worketh in a sinful man? Doth it, by any operation derived from itself, alter the state of the soul? *Doth it really take away sin; or but ascertain us of God's most gracious and merciful pardon?* The latter of which two is our assertion; the former, theirs," (Romanists.) And again, Hooker says, "As for the ministerial sentence of private absolution, it can be no more than a declaration what God hath done; it hath but the force of the Prophet Nathan's absolution, 'God hath taken away thy sin;' than which construction, *especially of words judicial*, there is not any thing more vulgar."

On this whole subject of Confession, we believe that the practice of Liturgical Confession to God, as now existing in our public services, with such occasional private examinations as every faithful Pastor is familiar with, may, and ought to come up to the full import of ancient teaching and practice. The infant condition of Christianity among idolaters and heathens, would of course lead to a very careful examination into the qualification of Converts, as is now practiced in all our missionary establishments. But any attempt to introduce the private Confessional, on the ground of primitive practice, is a forlorn hope. The whole subject will be found discussed in another place, where also we are anticipated in some of the remarks already made.

In speaking thus plainly of Bishop Ives' views, we here expressly disclaim all suspicion of his loyalty to the Church, or of his honesty and sincerity. We believe there are men in the Church, few in number, but exceedingly industrious, concerning whom we make no such disclaimer. They stand where Newman stood for years before his open apostasy—traitors—men with a lie in their right hand; "doing evil that good may come;" retaining their position in the Church to work mischief, until they shall be driven from it; men, the unutterable meanness and base hypocrisy of whose position, are only deepened by the injury inflicted upon an aggrieved and insulted Church. But that Bishop Ives has the slightest sympathy with their intentions, is altogether incredible.

COMPENDIUM OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, by J. C. L. Gieseler, Doctor of Philosophy and Theology, and Professor of Theology in Gottingen. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1849. 2 vols. 8vo.

An American edition of this work was published by Carey, Lea, & Blanchard in 1836, in Cunningham's Translation, from the third German edition. The present reprint is from the fourth German edition, translated by Samuel Davidson, LL. D.

The object and character of this work are expressed by the title to the Philadelphia edition. It is a "*Text-Book*" for the lecture room, rather than a "Compendium" for the general reader, and was so designed by its author. As a Text-Book, for a competent Lecturer, and for students suitably prepared, it might be a serviceable work; but as a work of history, for the ordinary student and general reader, it is comparatively valueless. The text of the author is brief and meagre, a mere skeleton, simply stating leading facts, or subjects, and referring to his copious marginal notes for proof. These notes, given in the original Latin or Greek, and without a translation, though necessarily brief, are selected usually with discrimination. There is another fact bearing upon the value of this work. The Author is a German Lutheran; and the topics in his book are arranged rather for the German than the English or American student. Upon many historical questions of importance at the present day the learner will consult this text-book almost in vain.

While, therefore, there are few lecturers in this country, whose profound acquaintance with the original authorities, renders them competent to adopt the plan of the German Professor, and while the want of familiarity with the original languages on the part of most students, must prevent its adoption in our Theological Seminaries, still it is a valuable addition to our Ecclesiastical literature. And yet, for the reasons which we have stated, it is impossible that it should take the place of the comparatively impartial and full history of Mosheim, which will

maintain its position as a standard class and text-book, in preference to any thing which has yet been issued from the press.

Indeed, for the general reader, Gieseler is far inferior to Neander; whose work, though rather a philosophy of history, than history itself, and very execrable philosophy besides, according to orthodox standards, is even now, though in an unfinished state, a vast monument of industry and research.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, from the *Discovery of the Continent to the Organization of, and Government under, the Federal Constitution*. By Richard Hildreth. In three Volumes, 8vo. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1849.

We believe this to be the most impartial and reliable history of the United States yet written. It seems to be unsectarian in spirit, and exhibits a laborious acquaintance with authorities. Its style is perspicuous and unadorned, as it should be. It has been most unjustly characterized by hypercritics as dry and tedious; and so, doubtless, is the simplicity of truth to our mawkish sentimentalists. Hildreth will take his place among the standard historians of our Country.

We here, however, say distinctly, that the early history of the Colonies of New England has never yet been fairly written. The intent and conduct of the English Government in the establishment of the Colonies, have been imperfectly and erroneously presented. In this light, we ask careful attention to the paper in our present Number, on the "Charter of the Massachusetts Bay Company." Our readers will perceive that it is a contribution of no ordinary value.

THE MONUMENTS OF EGYPT; OR EGYPT A WITNESS FOR THE BIBLE. By Francis L. Hawks, D. D., LL. D. With notes of a voyage up the Nile, by an American. New York: Geo. P. Putnam. London: John Murray, 1850. 8vo. pp. 256, and 162. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

Egypt, the grand Mausoleum of ancient Art, Science, and Literature; Egypt, the boast of modern infidels, as the key to unlock and expose the inner chambers of Superstition and Priestcraft; Egypt, the home of the Pyramids and the Sphinx, of Monuments and splendid ruins, which awe and confound the modern traveler; which rebukes the self-complacency of our times as with the presence of a loftier spirit; this land of wonders, and of mysterious silence, is waking from her long sleep of ages, and is uttering her verdict, to confound the whining Skeptic, and to establish beyond the possibility of doubt, the truth of God's Holy Word, the BIBLE. It is a wonderful synchronism, that that same Science which is undermining national barriers, breaking the iron chains of exclusiveness in China, Hindostan, Turkey, and Rome, and thus bringing men into new social relations, and under new social influences, is, at the same time, pouring floods of light upon the truth and reality of Revealed Religion. Assyria and Egypt, Nineveh and Rosetta, are rising up, unimpeachable witnesses to "the Truth as it is in Jesus."

The work of Dr. Hawks has a two-fold design; first, to make intelligible to the commonest reader the present state of discovery in respect to the mysterious hieroglyphical language; and then to show the bearing of that discovery upon the records of the Inspired page. Both these objects we think Dr. Hawks has entirely accomplished. The fragmentary character of early Egyptian history—the incipient labors of Dr. Young, in connection with the "Rosetta Stone"—the extraordinary labors of the younger Champollion, and his wonderful success in deciphering the hieroglyphical characters, for which Dr. Young had invented the key; (Dr. Young first established the *fact* of the *alphabetic* character of hieroglyphics; and also the *alphabetic force* of a few hieroglyphical characters;) and the different methods of writing on the part of the Egyptians, are first clearly, though briefly described; and he then proceeds to "bring the testimony furnished by Egyptian antiquities into juxtaposition with the sacred history." In manly grasp of his subject, clear arrangement, and lucid style, Dr. Hawks' work exhibits the head and heart of the Christian Scholar. He makes no pretensions in this work to *originality*; he appears rather as an apologist for, than an expositor of the Bible; and his object is, to cause the labors of others in this field to subserve a high and holy end.

The only similar effort of this kind previously made, was the work of Dr. Hengstenberg, published in 1840, "Egypt and the Books of Moses," and translated by Dr. Robbins in 1843. This is a book of much research and value; but its tedious minuteness, its lack of order and method, its elaborate learning, in discussing matters of the most insignificant character, make it a dull book, and it has been comparatively little known. The volume of Dr. Hawks, however, is one which will be read with avidity; and it will give the reader clear and distinct impressions, upon a subject hitherto wrapped in obscurity.

The "Notes of a Voyage up the Nile," by a gentleman just returned from Egypt, are wholly an independent work, and have no reference to the labors of Dr. Hawks, except as incidentally throwing light upon them. Though his name does not appear, we pronounce him an intelligent traveler, and an agreeable writer, and shall hope to hear from him from some one of the distant fields whither he says his thoughts are directed.

The whole work is exceedingly valuable, and of stirring interest, and will form the subject of a paper for our pages, which we think we may promise for an early number. The illustrations, of which there are nearly fifty, are extremely well done; and the execution, on the part of the Publisher, it is sufficient to say, is in his very best style.

**THE CHURCH CHANT-BOOK:** *designed to facilitate the practice of Chanting in Churches and the Private Devotional Circle; comprising a large and varied collection of Chant Tunes in the Gregorian and Modern Modes, adapted to the ordinary and extraordinary services of the Protestant Episcopal Church; with an Introduction, and Instructions relative to the Mode of Performance.* Written, arranged, and in part composed by the Rev. William Staunton. New York: Stanford & Swords, 137 Broadway, 1849. 4to. pp. 60.

The above long and descriptive title sufficiently indicates the design of the work which it represents. Such a design as this needs no commendation; but we are happy to speak in praise of the general faithfulness and success with which it has been executed.

The importance of Chanting in the services of the Church, seems to have been little regarded of late by compilers and publishers of Church Music, and consequently not to have received due attention from organists and directors of choirs. The principal resort for Chant-Music has been to the meagre collections stitched into the end of the popular tune-books. The Congregational and Presbyterian sects, however, have been led at last to appreciate this beautiful and truly ecclesiastical style of music, and have attempted, with partial success, to introduce it into their very flexible and accommodating form of worship; and have in consequence been supplied by the indefatigable Mr. Mason of Boston with a "Book of Chants," which has at least the merit of being full and complete, but which is totally unfit for the uses of the Church.

The deficiency which we have pointed out, the book before us is well fitted to supply. Its external appearance is becoming to its subject and to the place which it is intended to occupy. It is printed on the finest of paper, with an excellence of musical typography which we have rarely seen in American books of Church Music. The words, too, are printed in *full* upon every page, directly under the music to which they are adapted,—a convenience which beginners in chanting will be able to appreciate.

The work is introduced by a thorough course of Lessons in Chanting, accompanied by some judicious and discriminating remarks on Style of Performance. The selection of music which follows is, as the title-page professes, "large and varied," and yet contains little that would be disapproved by the severest taste. The editor's own contributions form by no means the least valuable portion of the compilation.

Having said thus much in commendation, we must be allowed to notice what seem to us to be faults, in that most important department—the arrangement of the words. The first is, that the notation for cadences is not in all cases conformed

to the usages of most of our Churches, nor to the rules which good sense and good taste have established. The second relates to the general application of the music of the chant to the poetry of the psalms and other canticles. The beautiful aptness with which the two members of the chant correspond to the two members of the Hebrew stanza, no ingenuity could improve. The original responsive effect of the Hebrew chant is fully produced in our modern music. This effect, however, is quite lost in the arrangement adopted by Mr. Mason in his *Book of Chants*; in which both members of the parallelism are assigned to one member of the Chant. Some of our arrangers, however, and those of the highest authority, have gone to the contrary extreme, and divided some of the canticles (particularly the *Te Deum*) in such a manner as often to distribute a single short sentence through both members of the chant, thus hiding the responsive effect of the poetry, besides greatly protracting the length of the performance, and often quite destroying the principal characteristic of the chant—the recitative.

We welcome this book, the production of a minister of the Church, as an evidence of a disposition on the part of her musicians to provide for her wants in this department of her service. The peculiar requirements of the music of the Church, as distinguished from that of the sects, deserves more extended discussion than our space will at present allow.

TWO TREATISES ON THE CHURCH; the first by Thomas Jackson, D. D., the second by Robert Sanderson, D. D., formerly Lord Bishop of Lincoln. To which is added, *A Letter of Bishop Cosin, on the Validity of the Orders of the Foreign Reformed Churches, with Introductory Remarks*, by William Goode, M. D. Philadelphia: H. Hooker, 1844. 12mo. pp. 238.

Of the contents of this volume, the Treatise of Bishop Sanderson, and the Letter of Bishop Cosin, are both very brief; containing 13 and 10 pages respectively; and are noticeable, rather as expressing the opinions of their respective authors, than as a vindication of those opinions. The Introduction by the Compiler, Mr. Goode, a name well known to our readers, was written in 1843, at a time when the Tractarian excitement in England was at its height. The object of this compilation, the compiler states in his Introduction, was to present the views of these Authors respecting "the nature and constitution of the Church." Mr. Goode's intention evidently was, to make prominent the theory of the "invisible Church." Mr. Jackson, however, is very far from agreeing, on the whole, with the views of Mr. Goode. Mr. Jackson, whose treatise is dated 1625, lived at a time when Calvinistic opinions were rife in the English Church, and he himself sympathized in them. Hence he sometimes speaks of those who have been called with an "effectual calling," as constituting an *invisible Church*; yet Dr. Jackson says expressly, "that the visible Church was, in the apostles' time and after, the true Church of God, we never denied; nor will we contend with him, whether the true Church of God on earth can ever fail; no, not whether it ceaseth to be visible. Where then is the difference? *The true Church of God is always visible—the visible Church is always the true Church of God.*" The former he avers, the latter he denies. Again, and in still stronger terms, Dr. Jackson says, "we never denied obedience to the visible Church, which consists of good and bad, which contains in it, as well the reprobate as the elect."

In Mr. Goode's introduction, we observe a singular carelessness in the use of language, and from which he yet deduces important inferences, to which we will advert. He says, "However much, however justly, we may value that apostolical form of government which we have the happiness to inherit from the Christians of primitive times, it is not this, but the purity of our faith, that constitutes us members of the Church of Christ." And he adds, "we must either maintain, with the Tractarians, that members of non-episcopal communions are not members of Christ's Church; or we must admit that if we turn our backs upon them, we are eschewing the communion of Christ's saints, on the mere ground of a non-essential difference in the frame work of our Churches." This is unquestionably a most singular sentence from an intelligent Church divine. The "form of government" of the Church is one thing; what constitutes "membership" in the Church



is another thing. We may admit that "*members of non-episcopal communions*" are members of Christ's Church, without admitting that those communions possess the "*frame work of Churches*." Churchmen, in refusing an open and free intercommunion with these denominations, are bound to admit that these denominations are not "*Churches*," but are living in a state of schism, which is sinful; or else that Churchmen themselves are guilty of sin, and virtually of schism, in refusing said free and open intercommunion. Upon their own principles, Churchmen are bound to take one or the other of these positions. To us, it is a thought pleasing and grateful, that we may look upon members of these communions, pious and truly devoted, as we believe multitudes of them to be, as Christians, baptized with us into the one Holy Catholic Church of Christ; although these communions or societies, as such, may lack the true notes, or marks of a Church of Christ.

The treatise of Dr. Jackson, which occupies one hundred and seventy-two pages of the present volume, and though written in the thetical and syllogistical style of the times, is a valuable work upon the Church, and is worthy of that regard in which it has been held for more than two hundred years.

*PUBLIC ECONOMY for the United States.* By Calvin Colton. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co., 1848.

This is a large octavo volume, containing thirty-three Chapters, and 536 well printed octavo pages. It is designed distinctly as a work for the United States. In his opening Chapter, the author states what are the "*new points*" of his work. The first is his definition of Public Economy; that it is the application of knowledge derived from experience to a given position, to given interests, and to given institutions of an independent State or Nation for the increase of public and private wealth. Others of his "*new points*" are, that public economy has never yet been reduced to a science, but that its propositions down to this time are *empirical* laws; an attempt to subject his propositions to the most rigid test of the canons of experimental induction, as laid down by logicians; that labor is capital, and the parent of all other capital; that protective duties in the United States are not taxes; a consideration of the different States of Society in the United States, and in Europe; the foundation of the value of money; the distinction between money as a *subject*, and as an *instrument* of trade; that money in every commercial community may be called "*the tool of trade*;" that price is not an attribute of money when employed as the instrument of trade; that an American protective tariff is identical with Free Trade in its operation and results; that the destiny of Freedom is yet in the earlier stages of its career; that the struggle of the American Revolution was based on the same principle as that now contested between Free Trade and Protection; the reasons for the rise and progress of the theory of Free Trade; that freedom consists in the enjoyment of commercial rights, and in the independent control of commercial values fairly acquired; the necessity of American Protection to protect it; that Free Trade is a license for depredation; that there cannot be two kinds of economy, one for private and one for public purposes.

These points the author discusses, more or less at large, in his subsequent pages; and they will show pretty clearly the character of the work. Mr. Colton has the reputation of a clear and vigorous writer, and he has expended upon this volume several of the best years of his life. It has passed, we believe, through a first edition. It does not fall within our province to discuss the soundness or unsoundness of the author's positions.



## ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

### SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.\*

#### ORDINATIONS.

##### DEACONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Babbitt, B. B.,	Henshaw,	Sept. 29,	Grace, Providence, R. I.
Byllesby, De Witt C.,	Doane,	Sept. 23,	St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
Chevers, G. W.,	Henshaw,	Sept. 29,	Grace, Providence, R. I.
Cumming, E. H.,	McIlvaine,	Sept. 8,	St. Luke's, Granville, Ohio.
Dashiel, E. F.,	Whittingham,	Sept. 23,	St. Andrew's, Baltimore, Md.
Hayden, G. B.,	Brownell,	Sept. 19,	St. Michael's, Litchfield, Ct.
Jarvis, William O.,	"	"	"
Johnson, George,	McIlvaine,	Sept. 8,	St. Luke's, Granville, Ohio.
Whipple, H. B.,	DeLancey,	Aug. 17,	Trinity, Geneva, W. N. Y.
Weller, R. Heber,	Otey,	Oct. 21,	Calvary, Memphis, Tenn.

##### PRIESTS.

Rev. A. D. Benedict,	McIlvaine,	Sept. 4,	St. Paul's, Chillicothe, Ohio.
" T. J. Carter,	C. Chase,	Nov. 20,	Caroline, Setauket, N. Y.
" T. A. Eaton,	Doane,	Oct. 1,	Grace, Newark, N. J.
" Lewis Green,	Eastburn,	Oct. 12,	Trinity, Vandeusenville, Mass.
" George Hall,	Lee,	Oct. 26,	St. Mark's, Millsboro', Del.
" F. D. Harriman,	Brownell,	Sept. 18,	St. Paul's, Bantam Falls, Conn.
" E. W. Murray,	Burgess,	Nov. 23,	Christ, Gardiner, Maine.
" R. S. Nash,	McIlvaine,	Sept. 8,	St. Luke's, Granville, Ohio.
" Chas. Reynolds,	C. Chase,	Dec. 6,	Christ, North Brooklyn, N. Y.
" S. Reed,	DeLancey,	Aug. 17,	Trinity, Geneva, W. N. Y.
" Joel Rudderow,	Potter,	Oct. 3,	St. Peter's, Bloomsburg, Penn.
" L. W. Russ,	DeLancey,	Nov. 11,	Trinity, Geneva, W. N. Y.
" A. G. Shears,	Brownell,	Oct. 12,	Christ, Sharon, Conn.
" W. M. Steele,	Otey,	Oct. 24,	Calvary, Memphis, Tenn.
" J. H. Ticknor,	Cobbs,	Oct. 14,	———, Prairieville, Ala.
" T. Wilcoxson,	Brownell,	Sept. 18,	St. Paul's, Bantam Falls, Conn.
" F. S. Wiley,	Potter,	Oct. 28,	All Saints, Moyamensing, Penn.
" Moses E. Wilson,	DeLancey,	Nov. 11,	Trinity, Geneva, W. N. Y.

\* Several pages of Book Notices, Home and Foreign Intelligence, Obituaries, and Literary Intelligence, are necessarily crowded out.

## REMOVALS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>To Church or Parish.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Rev. P. T. Babbitt,	Trinity School,	Raleigh, N. C.
" J. M. Bartlett,	Ascension,	Gloucester, N. J.
" J. J. Bowden,	St. Matthew's,	Jersey City, N. J.
" J. B. Britton,	Christ,	Dayton, Ohio.
" S. T. Carpenter,	St. Peter's,	Smyrna, Del.
" T. J. Carter,	Grace,	Cleveland, Ohio.
" T. W. Coit, D. D.,	Trinity College,	Hartford, Conn.
" F. J. Clerc,	St. John's,	St. Louis, Mi.
" A. Croswell,	St. Paul's,	Brunswick, Me.
" Seth Davis,	Zion,	E. Bloomfield, W. N. Y.
" M. Douglass,	Trinity,	Seneca Falls, W. N. Y.
" G. W. Dubois,		Warren, Ohio.
" T. A. Eaton,	Grace,	Newark, N. J.
" T. T. Fales,	Christ,	Waltham, Mass.
" S. Fuller, D. D.,	Christ,	Andover, Mass.
" J. P. Hammond,	Trinity,	Upper Marlboro', Md.
" Daniel Henshaw,	St. Paul's,	North Kingston, R. I.
" Wm. Horton,	St. Paul's,	Brookline, Mass.
" W. O. Jarvis,	St. Mark's,	Bridgewater, Conn.
" W. M. Jackson,	St. Paul's,	Norfolk, Va.
" David Kerr,	Trinity,	Yazoo City, Miss.
" J. H. Linebaugh,	St. James',	Baton Rouge, La.
" J. McNamara,		Walworth Co., Wis.
" J. A. McKenny,	St. Paul's,	Prince George Co., Md.
" R. S. Nash,	Christ,	Lancaster Co., Va.
" E. Neville, D. D.,	Christ,	New Orleans, La.
" E. M. Porter,	Ascension,	Fall River, Mass.
" T. S. Savage, M. D.,	Trinity,	Pass Christian, Miss.
" J. Shackleford,	St. Mary's,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
" B. W. Stone,	St. Michael's,	Litchfield, Conn.
" B. F. Taylor,	St. Luke's,	Rossville, Staten Is'd, N. Y.
" J. E. Van Bokkelen,	St. Timothy's,	Catonsville, Md.
" F. M. Whittle,	St. James',	Pemberton, Va.
" F. S. Wiley,	Grace,	Honesdale, Pa.

## CONSECRATIONS.

<i>Church.</i>	<i>Place.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>
All Angels',	New York City,	C. Chase,	Dec. 1.
Christ,	North Brooklyn, N. Y.	C. Chase,	Dec. 6.
St. George's,	New York City,	C. Chase,	Dec. 4.
St. James',	Newtown, L. I., N. Y.	C. Chase,	Nov. 15.
St. John's,	West Hoboken, N. J.	Doane,	Oct. 2.
St. Mark's,	Millsboro', Del.	Lee,	Oct. 26.
St. Mark's,	West Islip, L. I., N. Y.,	C. Chase,	Nov. 23.
Church of the Nativity,	Huntsville, Ala.	Cobbs,	Nov. 4.

## DIOCESAN INTELLIGENCE.

NEW YORK.—The *Sixty-Fifth* Annual Convention of this Diocese met in St. John's Chapel, New York city, on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, the 26th, 27th, and 28th of September. The Rev. William Creighton, D. D., was chosen President, and Rev. Dr. Haight, Secretary. From the neatly printed Journal, we copy the following summary of statistics.

Number of Clergy present in the Convention, 151; absent, 25. On the roll of the Convention, 176. Not entitled to seats, 71. Number of Clergy belonging to the Diocese, 247. Candidates for Orders, 35.

*Parishes.*—Number of Churches and Chapels represented, 139; not represented, 57; entitled to representation, 196; not in union with the Convention, 8. Number of Churches and Chapels in the Diocese, 204. Seven Churches were admitted into union at this Convention.

*Ordinations.*—Deacons, 12; Priests 11; total, 23. *Churches.*—Corner stones laid, 2; Consecrated, 5. *Confirmations*, in 89 Churches, 1348.

<i>Canonical Collections.</i> —For the Episcopal Fund, from 30 Churches,	\$125.44
"    Diocesan    "    "    91    "	972.48
"    Education    "    "    39    "	193.54
"    Missionary    "    "    110    "	2826.81
"    Aged and infirm Clergy, 87    "	2067.50

\$6185.77

The following is the summary of Bishop Whittingham's services in the Diocese of New York, taken from his report to the Convention:—"I have examined and ordained twelve Deacons and eleven Priests, at one stated and seven special Ordinations; have consecrated five churches, and laid two corner-stones of churches; have confirmed thirteen hundred and fifty-eight persons, at eighty-nine administrations of the rite; have administered the Holy Communion twenty-five times; have preached one hundred and two times, and have delivered eighty-eight other addresses. In order to attend these ministrations, I have traveled about three thousand six hundred and fifty miles."

The question of exclusion of non-communicants from sittings in the Convention, laid over from the last Convention, was postponed, by a vote of 62 to 48 of the Clergy, and 76 to 28 of the Laity.

The following preamble and resolutions were offered by the Rev. Dr. Higbee.

"Whereas the House of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, in the General Convention of 1847, passed a canon in the words following:

"'Whenever the penalty of suspension shall be inflicted on a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, in this Church, the sentence shall specify on what terms, or at what time, said penalty shall cease.'

"And whereas the Diocese and Diocesan of New York have been for a long time suffering under the disabilities which it was the design of the canon to prevent in future: therefore,

"Resolved, That the Standing Committee be requested to present, at an early day, an address to the House of Bishops, praying that venerable body to adopt such measures as may render the wise provisions of said canon of 1847 available to the relief of our Diocese; that so, the objects may be accomplished of the unanimous prayer of this Convention addressed to the General Convention of 1847."

The votes upon this resolution were 91 clerical and 69 lay ayes, and 36 clerical and 46 lay noes. A portion of the minority united in a protest against this resolution, which was not allowed a place on the Journal of the Convention, by the following vote—Clergy, noes 84, ayes 29; Laity, noes 61, ayes 29. We observe the manifestation of a spirit of concession on the part of the majority, especially in the choice of the Missionary Committee of the Diocese. The following persons were, on nomination, appointed:—Rev. T. House Taylor, D. D., Chairman; Rev. L. P. W. Balch, D. D., Secretary; C. N. S. Rowland, Esq., Treasurer; Rev. W. Richmond, Rev. Lot Jones, Rev. Richard Cox, C. Oakley, Esq., S. Brown, Esq., W. A. Spencer, Esq., E. W. Dunham, Esq.

The following gentlemen were elected members of the Standing Committee:—Clergy—Rev. William Berrian, D. D., Rev. John McVickar, D. D., Rev. Benjamin I. Haight, D. D., Rev. Samuel Seabury, D. D. Laity—Hon. Samuel Jones, Hon. Murray Hoffman, Hon. Gulian C. Verplanck, Floyd Smith, Esq.

The following letter has lately been addressed to the President of the Standing Committee, by the Rev. Mr. Forbes, late pastor of St. Luke's Church, in the city of New York:

NEW YORK, 21st Nov., 1849.

To the Rev. Wm. Berrian, D. D., Pres. of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of New York:

Rev. and Dear Sir,—You may conceive that it is with no ordinary emotion that I feel myself constrained to declare to you, as President of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of New York, that it is my intention no longer to exercise the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church, it having become my deep and conscientious conviction that duty to God requires of me to unite myself to the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, in communion with the See of Rome, to which alone I feel that my allegiance is due.

With great personal consideration, I remain, Rev. and Dear Sir, your obedient servant,  
JOHN MURRAY FORBES.

VERMONT.—The *Fifty-Ninth* Annual Convention of this Diocese was held in Christ Church, Bethel, on the 19th of September. We glean from the Journal the following statistics and items of intelligence. Confirmations, during the year, 128. Clergymen belonging to the Diocese, 23; of whom 6 are not in charge of any parish. There are 3 candidates for Holy Orders. Several parishes are vacant. The following persons were elected members of the Standing Committee, and Delegates to the General Convention:

*Standing Committee.*—Rev. John A. Hicks, D. D., Rev. Joel Clapp, D. D., Rev. George B. Manser, Hon. Isaac F. Redfield, George B. Shaw, Esq., Ozias Seymour, Esq. *Delegates to the General Convention.*—Clerical Deputies—Rev. Joel Clapp, D. D., Rev. John A. Hicks, D. D., Rev. George B. Manser, Rev. Henry Blackaller. Lay Deputies—Hon. Charles K. Williams, Hon. Isaac F. Redfield, George B. Shaw, Esq., A. O. Aldis, Esq.

#### OBITUARY.

The Rev. FREDERICK MILLER, Rector of Trinity Church, Branford, Ct., died at the Rectory, Oct. 3d, 1849, aged 38 years. Mr. Miller was born at Potsdam, St. Lawrence county, N. Y., Oct. 8, 1811. His parents were educated as Congregationalists, and his mother was a truly pious member of that denomination. At about the age of 16, he left his father's family, and became clerk in a mercantile house in his native town, to a gentleman who was a devoted Churchman. At this period he became acquainted with the Church, and a member of it, and materially assisted in the formation of the parish in his native town. Feeling that he had a higher work to do, he pursued his studies in Potsdam, preparatory to entering College, and entered the Sophomore class of Washington, now Trinity College, in September, 1837, and graduated in 1840. He commenced his theological studies while a member of College, and greatly injured his health and impaired his constitution by his close application to his studies. He was admitted to the Holy Order of Deacons, by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Brownell, Oct. 27th, 1841, in Christ Church, Hartford; and to the Order of Priests, by the same Bishop, Sept. 28th, 1842, in St. Peter's Church, Cheshire. He took charge of St. Peter's Parish, Cheshire, in November, 1841, where he remained until Easter, 1844, when he accepted a call to Trinity Parish, Branford. In the parochial relation he was particularly happy. He was fitted for its enjoyments, took delight in its duties, and was successful in promoting its objects. He was very strongly attached to the principles of the Church; and yet by his prudent and holy living he won the respect of those whom he did not convince. As a scholar, his mind was well disciplined; and for the pursuits to which his life was devoted, well furnished. As a preacher, he was clear in his style, earnest in manner, combining a happy union of instruction and exhortation. With but a moderate salary, he had procured one of the best selected private libraries in the Diocese. The Parish at Branford grew under his care; and, at the time of his death, contemplated the speedy erection of a new Parish Church. During the past summer, he had been active in preparing a class for the rite of Confirmation, and on the last Sunday afternoon before he was attacked with fatal disease, and even then seriously indisposed, he preached from the

significant words, "Little children, it is the last time." On the Monday following, he was prostrated with dysentery, and gradually sunk down, until Wednesday, Oct. 3d, 1849, when he fell asleep in Jesus. He leaves behind him a beloved wife and five helpless orphans, whom at the last he committed in unwavering faith to his Heavenly Father, saying, "God will take care of them."

Mr. Miller's life was one of uncommon purity and self-denial. Sincerity and self-sacrifice were marked traits in his character. He lived not for himself; and at last, like his blessed Saviour, laid down his life for the sheep. He held a high place, not only in the esteem of his people, but in the respect, affection, and confidence of his brethren of the Clergy; several of whom have agreed to supply his Parish with services until Easter, for the benefit of his bereaved family. We are glad to learn that a more appropriate Memorial is in preparation, by one who has every facility for presenting a correct view of his symmetrical and beautiful character.

## SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

### CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND.

#### ORDINATIONS.

On Sunday, Sept. 23d, being one of the stated times for Ordination, the following number of persons were admitted to the Orders of Priest and Deacon:

By the Bishop of Carlisle, 1 Deacon and 4 Priests.

By the Bishop of Chester, 15 Deacons and 7 Priests.

By the Bishop of Ely, 3 Deacons and 5 Priests.

By the Bishop of Lichfield, 13 Deacons and 12 Priests.

By the Bishop of Lincoln, 5 Deacons and 3 Priests.

By the Bishop of Ripon, 13 Deacons and 13 Priests.

By the Bishop of Worcester, 23 Deacons and 17 Priests.

By the Lord Primate of Ireland, 3 Deacons and 4 Priests.

By the Bishop of Down and Connor, 7 Deacons and 9 Priests.

By the Bishop of Oxford, 8 Deacons and 1 Priest.

On Saturday, Sept. 29, by the Bishop of London, Rev. Thomas Maxwell and Rev. George Nicol (colored) were admitted to the Order of Priests.

On Sunday, Oct. 21, by the Bishop of Exeter, 10 Deacons and 9 Priests; and by the Bishop of Manchester, 11 Deacons and 9 Priests.

TOTAL, by 13 Bishops, 122 Deacons and 95 Priests.

**DEATH OF THE BISHOP OF NORWICH.**—Died, on the 6th Sept., at Brahan Castle, near Dingwall, Ross-shire, Right Rev. the Bishop of Norwich. The Rev. prelate was only ill for a short time, but his malady fatally terminated in a congestion of the brain. The deceased was the second son of Sir T. J. Stanley, of Alderley, Cheshire, and was born in 1779, so that he was 70 years of age. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. He was formerly Rector of Alderley, and was appointed Bishop of Norwich in 1837. He was also clerk of the closet to the Queen, President of the Linnean Society, and one of the commissioners appointed in 1848, to inquire into the state of the British Museum. He was greatly beloved and respected by all classes in his Diocese, in consequence of his exertions in promoting education, and in supporting charitable institutions of every description. He was married, in 1810, to the daughter of the Rev. Oswald Leycester, by whom he leaves a large family. He was the author of the "Familiar History of British Birds," a work which has acquired an extensive circulation.

The Right Rev. Dr. Graham, Bishop of Chester, succeeds to a seat in the House of Lords, while Dr. Stanley's successor will be excluded until another vacancy in the Episcopal list takes place. When the bill passed for the erection of Man-

chester into an independent Episcopal See, it was thought unadvisable to increase the number of Spiritual Peers, and an arrangement was effected by virtue of which the junior Bishop (the two Archbishops and the Bishops of London, Durham, and Winchester, being excepted) should not have a seat in the House of Lords.

In pursuance of her Majesty's *congé d'élire*, directed to the Dean and Chapter, an election has been held, and the Rev. Samuel Hinds, D. D., Dean of Carlisle, has been elected Bishop of the vacant See. He was a native of Barbados, and has the reputation of an active missionary and devoted parish priest. The English papers speak approvingly of the appointment.

DEATH OF THE BISHOP OF LLANDAFF.—The Rt. Rev. Edward Coplestone, D. D., died at the Episcopal residence near Chepstow, on Sunday, Oct. 14th, in the 74th year of his age. Dr. Coplestone was the native of a county, prolific, beyond all others, in English statesmen, lawyers, and theologians. He was born at Offwell, in Devonshire, on the 2d of February, 1776, and was educated at home, by his father, (who was prebendary of Exeter,) until he attained the age of 15 years, when he was elected a Scholar of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. He obtained the annual prize for Latin verse, on the prescribed theme of "Marius sitting among the ruins of Carthage." In 1796 he obtained another prize, for a Latin essay, "on agriculture;" and in 1797, he was appointed College Tutor. In 1802 he was made Professor of Poetry, and published his *Prælectiones Academicæ*, a work which is now forgotten, and was never considered by his friends worth bringing into notoriety. In due course of time, Dr. Coplestone, having served the office of Proctor, was elected Provost of his College, (in 1814,) and shortly afterwards, he published his "Discourses on Predestination," the most admirable specimen he ever produced of the moderation of his opinions, his great learning, the acuteness and depth of his understanding, his catholicism, and the perfect freedom of his mind from all sectarian or schismatical tendencies. He republished, at the same time, a discourse by Archbishop King, on a kindred subject; and is thought by many persons to have pursued a middle course, more happily than any of his predecessors, between the opposite extremes of his Antinomian and Pelagian heresies. He was created Bishop of Llandaff, in 1827, under the Administration of which Sir Robert Peel was a member, whose good opinion he is said to have conciliated by a pamphlet on the currency question. He may be considered the founder of that school in theology and literature that numbers among its pupils Arnold, Whately, Hampden, and others whose influence has been felt extensively in the Church, and has given a new tone to political and ethical philosophy. The connection of the Deanery of London with the Bishoprick of Llandaff was only a temporary one, rendered necessary by the poverty of the Welsh See, which values at no more than \$1000 per annum. The metropolitan preferment was therefore held with the Bishoprick *in commendam*, to enable the Prelate to "maintain hospitality" and support the dignity of a Lord of Parliament; but such an objectionable plurality will be precluded in future, by a recent arrangement of the Commissioners, which provides a stipend of \$4500 a year for his Lordship's successors in the Episcopal chair of Llandaff. In a recent visitation charge of the Bishop of Llandaff, it is stated that fifty-three parsonage-houses had been added since his accession to the See, and that five more had then been undertaken; whilst, since his former visitation, in 1845, twenty-nine schools had been completed or undertaken. To large and populous districts, where there was no service, clergymen had been appointed, some of whom minister in churches lately erected, and others in school-rooms, or similar buildings, temporarily licensed for the purpose.

The Rev. Alfred Ollivant, D. D., has been nominated by the Crown to the Bishoprick of Llandaff. The Doctor is Prebendary of Brecon, Canon of St. David's, Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, and Rector of Somersham, Huntingdonshire. He was formerly Vice-President of Llampeter College, in which many of the Welsh Clergy have been educated. Though not a native of Wales, Dr. Ollivant must be, from his former position, and from his long intercourse with the Principality, thoroughly conversant with the Welsh language.

**DEAN OF CARLISLE.**—This Deanery, made vacant by the election of Rev. Dr. Hinds to the Bishoprick of Norwich, has been conferred by the Premier on the Rev. Dr. Tait, Head Master of Rugby School. The Rev. gentleman, who was formerly a Tutor of eminence at Oxford, succeeded Dr. Arnold in 1842, and is married to a daughter of Archdeacon Spooner. He has the reputation of being a sound scholar and respectable divine.

**DEAN OF THE CATHEDRAL OF ST. PAUL'S, LONDON.**—The Queen has directed letters patent to be passed under the great seal, appointing the Rev. Henry Hart Milman, M. A., to this important Deanery; the same being vacant by the death of the late Bishop Coplestone, by whom it was held. Dr. Milman is a Conservative in politics, and a man of talent, having been a distinguished Tutor of his College, and a first-class man, and having obtained all the University prizes for composition in prose and verse, as well as the Professorship of Poetry at Oxford, and been Bampton Lecturer in 1827. He is author of a "History of the Jews," also, of a "History of Christianity," and Editor of an edition of Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," with a preface and numerous notes; all of which have been republished in this country. Some of his doctrinal sentiments are very objectionable.

**THE NEW CANON OF WESTMINSTER.**—The Rev. William Cureton, of the British Museum, has been appointed to the Canonry of Westminster, vacant by the promotion of the Rev. Mr. Milman to the Deanery of St. Paul's, London. Mr. Cureton has the reputation of being one of the best Oriental scholars of the age. The King of Prussia has just conferred on him the Prussian gold medal of the Order of Merit, in approval of his edition of the Syriac Ignatian Epistles.

**RESIGNATION OF THE BISHOP OF MADRAS.**—The Right Rev. Dr. G. T. Spencer, one of the oldest Colonial Bishops, has intimated his intention of no longer presiding over the Diocese of Madras, in consequence of his impaired health. The duties connected with the administration of the spiritual affairs of this Diocese are of a most laborious character; converts to Christianity having been made by thousands, more especially at Tinnevely and Tanjore. The venerable Archdeacon Dealtry, who has spent a large portion of his life as a missionary in India, and who for some years held the Archdeaconry of Calcutta, has been nominated as the successor of Dr. Spencer in the Bishoprick of Madras. Archdeacon Dealtry had been preaching at the Hon. and Rev. Baptist W. Noel's church, in Bedford-row, but was to resign this charge on the second Sunday in November, to the Rev. Thomas Nolan, incumbent of St. Barnabas, Liverpool.

#### FRANCE.

The President of the Republic has dismissed his Ministry, owing, as he says, to a want of "entire unanimity of ideas, of views, and of conviction," between him and them. Considerable excitement is exhibited in Paris; the Conservatives and Bourbons are furious, as they see in this new demonstration a determination to perpetuate his term of office perhaps for life.

#### HUNGARY.

This miserable nation has at last yielded the struggle and submitted to its oppressors, who are assassinating the leaders of the insurrection with summary vengeance. Many of the refugees having escaped to Turkey, have embraced Mohamedanism, numbering already, it is said, more than three hundred, among whom is General Bem, and two other distinguished leaders. A considerable degree of religious toleration has been granted by the Sultan, and both Christians and Jews enjoy certain civil and religious privileges.

#### ROME.

The Pope has removed from Gaeta to Naples. Assassinations of French soldiers occur daily at Rome, and popular hostility in the royal city, to the Pope, is



very great. Louis Napoleon, in attempting the restoration of the Pope, has doubtless an eye upon the *quid pro quo*. He will not allow Austrian interference; and the Pope dare not confide in his French allies.

**RENUNCIATIONS OF POPERY.**—John Lambe abjured the errors of the Church of Rome, on Sunday, a few weeks since, at Trinity Church, Gray's Inn-Road. The mercy of superior light into divine truth was acknowledged in the thanksgiving; and in a sermon preached relative to many of the tenets of the Church of Rome, and their diversity from catholic sentiment, the incumbent, the Rev. J. W. Worthington, D. D., took occasion to observe, that although this was the first public abjuration of Romish errors, it would not be the last, and that he had, up to that period, carefully restrained persons from these public confessions; but that the present aggressive attitude of the Church of Rome rendered them necessary; and that had he felt disposed, long since, hundreds, during his ministry at that Church, would gladly have offered the same public acknowledgment for the inestimable blessings of the pure truths of the Gospel, as taught in the Anglican Church. The course of such men as Wiseman, Newman, and others, in spreading the novelties and corruptions of Popery, is beginning to call up, in old England, a spirit of resistance, which will show itself in unmistakable demonstrations. In Ireland the work of secession is assuming an important aspect. The following extract from the Londonderry Sentinel of Oct. 5, will be read with surprise. Few persons are aware in this country of the success attending the exertions of the Irish Episcopal Clergy in winning their countrymen from the deadly errors of Romanism. *Upwards of ninety Priests, and many thousands of the Laity*, have, within the last few years, been led to embrace the doctrines of the Established Church.

"A Confirmation was held at the Parish Church of Kilcommon-Eriss, Diocese of Killala, on Friday, Sept. 21st, when upwards of 150 persons, principally adults, and converts from the Church of Rome, were confirmed by the Lord Bishop of Tuam. The church was crowded to excess, and the large assemblage was addressed by his Lordship, in one of the most feeling and truly instructive discourses it has ever been our privilege to listen to. On the subsequent Sunday, the Bishop again preached in the Church of Belmullet, on points principally connected with the Romish controversy, and we feel assured the plain, practical discourse and admonitions of his Lordship, so admirably suited to the capacities of the numbers who hung with profound attention on his words, will be blessed with the happiest results, not only in confirming the minds of those who dare to think for themselves on the most momentous of all subjects, but in stimulating the exertions of such of his Clergy as are laboring to rescue souls out of the darkness and error of Popery, and lead them into the glorious light of the Gospel and the truth as it is in Jesus."

#### MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

**THOUSANDTH ANNIVERSARY.**—Thursday, Oct. 25th, being the one thousandth anniversary of the birth of King Alfred the Great, was celebrated at Wantage, his birth place, with appropriate ceremonies. His noble character as a Monarch, as a Patron of Learning, as a Scholar, and as a Christian, was delineated by the several speakers.

**SIR JOHN FRANKLIN.**—The expeditions fitted out under Sir James Ross and Sir John Richardson have both returned to England, after having suffered almost incredible hardships, without having discovered the least trace of the intrepid explorer. The only hope now of his safety is based upon reports of some Esquimaux Indians, who signified to the master of a whaling vessel recently returned, the situation of vessels surrounded by ice, which answer to those which Sir John has in command.

**COLONY OF SOUTH AFRICA.**—The inhabitants of this colony are resisting resolutely the further introduction of British convicts, and are determined the colony shall no longer be a penal settlement. A public meeting at Capetown unanimously adopted strong resolutions, and pledged itself to carry them out.

